

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

1
Ag8III
L57



AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H. R. 7951

COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE
LEVER AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION BILL

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1913



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1913

}

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, September 23, 1913.

The committee this day met, Hon. Asbury F. Lever (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen of the committee, we are taking up this morning for hearing what is commonly known as the Lever agricultural extension bill. I will ask Dr. Galloway to present the proposition from his viewpoint.

STATEMENT OF DR. B. T. GALLOWAY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the committee has before it a bill to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture. This bill is a modification of the Lever bill, which passed the House last year and which was reintroduced in the Senate. I understand it to be the wish of the chairman and of the members of the committee that this discussion be opened with a consideration of the present bill in comparison with the old bill. I will endeavor merely to discuss the bill in detail, pointing out the differences between the existing measure and the former bill, the Secretary following with general statements as to the principles involved in the consideration of this bill.

As already noted, the present bill provides for cooperative agricultural extension work between the United States Department of Agriculture and the agricultural colleges in the several States. The old bill provided for the establishment of agricultural extension departments in connection with the agricultural colleges in the several States. The new bill differs from the old one in that it is a purely cooperative measure. In the present bill the words "agricultural extension departments" have been modified to "cooperative agricultural extension work," this being necessary simply to carry the proper phraseology through the bill. As already stated, in the original bill no provision was made for cooperation between the various State agricultural colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture, although the work that is naturally carried on would be carried on in very close relationship, and all of the extension and demonstration work carried on by the State continues, as well as that by the department, and under this bill they are correlated.

The CHAIRMAN. I would suggest that you take the bill up section by section and note the changes in the new bill as compared with the old bill.

Dr. GALLOWAY. That, Mr. Chairman, I was planning to do, laying the foundation for the specific statements by making this general statement as to the general differences.

Now, taking the bill by sections, if you will take section 2, members of the committee—it is rather difficult to follow these two sections for critical examination, but I think that we can call attention to the differences. In section 2 of the new bill provision is made for the conduct of the work in a manner mutually satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the heads of the agricultural colleges within the States. In the old bill, of course, this provision was not incorporated, because in that section there was no statement whatever requiring cooperative relationship. Following the phraseology of the old bill, no attempt is made to define the exact methods which shall be used in gathering information, except that the method of demonstration is mentioned, and later in the bill there is a prohibition against lectures in colleges. The procedure to be followed in the different States will be to serve the best interests and the particular usefulness within the States. In other words, there is no attempt in this bill to fasten upon the States a stereotyped form of extension work—that is, the same type of work for all the States. It is believed that such an attempt would be unwise, and for that reason the phraseology in the old bill has been mainly followed, giving the Secretary of Agriculture and the heads of the agricultural colleges within the States the power to shape up the projects and mutually approve them in such fashion that the work formulated for the State and projected within the State will be such as to best fit the needs of the individual State.

Possibly in passing it might clarify the situation if there are any questions to ask to ask them section by section.

Mr. MAGUIRE. In making the regulations somewhat lax, would not the States be likely to fail to come up to the requirements and simply use the funds?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Provision is made for that later, in another section.

Mr. HAWLEY. Do I understand that none of this work is to be done at the agricultural colleges?

Dr. GALLOWAY. The work is to be done throughout the States. The whole intent of this bill is to teach farmers on their own farms.

Mr. HAWLEY. Would any of the work be done at the agricultural colleges?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Occasionally there will be work done there, but the major portion of the work will be done throughout the State rather than at the agricultural colleges. In other words, this bill provides for taking agricultural education in various ways to the people throughout the States, including demonstrations, boys and girls' club work, and all other forms of extension work that may now be in vogue or developed later, but none of the money is to be used in teaching at the colleges, in the construction of buildings, or for any other purpose except as specifically mentioned later on in another section of the bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. It would not prevent the agricultural workers doing the work in the field if they thought it advantageous and using a number of people at the college because they had a plant there to use?

Dr. GALLOWAY. It is the design of the bill that the extension departments shall be organized at the colleges under the direction and supervision of the president or dean of the college and carried on throughout the States by and with the men connected with the colleges.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Have you any limitation on publications?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes; there is a limitation on publications in another section. Only 5 per cent of the money appropriated can be used for publications.

Mr. HAWLEY. Why did you omit the proviso in section 2 of the old bill?

Dr. GALLOWAY. We did not omit the proviso in section 2. Section 2 of the new bill is a modification of section 2 of the old bill. We omitted section 3 in the old bill. Section 3 in the old bill reads:

That all correspondence for the furtherance of the purposes of this act issued from the agricultural colleges to their agents or by the agents of the said extension departments thereof receiving the benefits of this act shall be transmitted in the mails of the United States free of charge.

It simply gives the franking privilege to the workers in these extension departments. The old bill did that. Owing to the cooperative relations that will exist between the Agricultural Department and the State colleges there will be no need for that clause. The franking privilege necessarily follows.

Mr. HAWLEY. The proviso in section 2 of the old bill reads:

Provided, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to interfere with either the demonstration of farm-management work as now conducted by the Department of Agriculture and known as the farmers' cooperative demonstration work and farm-management work.

Dr. GALLOWAY. That proviso was omitted because, as this is a cooperative measure and all projects are to be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the agricultural colleges, that proviso was considered unnecessary.

Mr. HEFLIN. The men who go out to do this farm demonstration work, will they continue to do that work under the appointment and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture as now?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes; that is the plan. It is thought, however, that that work can be made more effective if it is coordinated fully with the work now being carried on in the States or the demonstration work to be inaugurated by the States. The fact is that during the last two or three years there has been such a growing demand for this demonstration work throughout the country, the demand on the department for this type of work has been so great, as you well realize, that there is bound to be eventually confusion and chaos unless there is some early means taken of coordinating the work. The object of this bill is not in any way, as I understand it, to interfere with the work already in progress, but it is to make that feasible and practicable, and to coordinate all that work in such a way that the best interests of the whole country will be served.

Mr. HEFLIN. These men will be paid by the General Government; their salaries will be paid by the General Government?

Dr. GALLOWAY. From these Federal funds appropriated by the General Government; yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. Half of it will be paid by the amounts appropriated by the States also?

Dr. GALLOWAY. After the funds begin to come in from the States. That must be a matter of adjustment, however, in detail, between the Secretary of Agriculture and the State authorities.

I think it is understood that there is no necessity for section 3 of the old bill, which provides for the franking privilege, and the clause in the former bill, "*Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to interfere with either the demonstration or farm-management work"—that paragraph is not essential or necessary. The Secretary will have full authority to bring the work of the department into coordination with this other work.

Section 3 of the new bill or 4 of the old bill makes provision for the financing of the work. This clause, I might say, is practically the same as in the original bill with one exception, which I will refer to later. Four hundred and eighty thousand dollars is appropriated for each year, \$10,000 of which shall be paid annually in the manner hereinafter provided to each State which shall assent to the provisions of this act. Then after the first year there will be appropriated \$300,000, and the amount will be apportioned to each State based on the relation of the rural population of that State to the total rural population of the entire country. I have a table which shows the amount that each State will receive, assuming that this bill will go into effect in 1914, and if there is no objection I will put that table in the record. It indicates definitely and fully just what the total appropriation for each year will be. It might be of interest to cite one or two States. Alabama, for example, has a rural population of 1,767,662. It will receive the first year \$10,000. The next year it will receive \$10,000 plus the apportionment, making the total \$20,745.91. At the end of 1919, when there must necessarily be another revision, owing to the census, the State of Alabama will be receiving from the Federal Government \$63,729 for this work, and the State of Alabama will be putting in an equal amount. At the end of nine years there will be a grand total of \$3,000,000 going into the States for this work, and the States will be putting in an equal amount, making \$6,000,000 in all.

Mr. HEFLIN. Please put that table in the record.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes, sir; I will put it in the record.

(The table referred to by Dr. Galloway follows.)

LEVER BILL.

Payments to be made annually to each State, based upon the census of 1910, and assuming that the bill becomes a law in the fiscal year 1914.

State.	Rural population (census of 1910).	1914		1915		1916		1917	
		Annual appropriation of \$480,000, of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State (assuming that bill becomes a law in the fiscal year 1914).	Annual appropriation of \$480,000, of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State.	Annual appropriation of \$300,000, to be paid each State in the proportion which its rural population bears to total population of the United States.	Annual appropriation of \$480,000, of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State.	Additional appropriation of \$300,000, making \$600,000 to be paid each State in the proportion which its rural population bears to total population of the United States.	Annual appropriation of \$480,000, of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State.	Additional appropriation of \$300,000, making \$900,000 to be paid each State in the proportion which its rural population bears to total population of the United States.	Annual appropriation of \$480,000, of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State.
Alabama.....	1,767,662	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$10,745.91	\$20,745.91	\$10,000.00	\$21,491.82	\$10,000.00	\$32,237.73
Arizona.....	1,141,094	10,000.00	10,000.00	8,857.73	10,857.73	10,000.00	11,715.46	10,000.00	12,573.19
Arkansas.....	1,371,768	10,000.00	10,000.00	8,339.19	18,339.19	10,000.00	16,678.38	10,000.00	25,017.57
California.....	907,810	10,000.00	10,000.00	5,518.74	15,518.74	10,000.00	11,037.48	10,000.00	16,556.22
Colorado.....	394,184	10,000.00	10,000.00	2,396.31	12,396.31	10,000.00	4,792.62	10,000.00	7,188.93
Connecticut.....	114,917	10,000.00	10,000.00	698.61	10,698.61	10,000.00	1,397.22	10,000.00	2,095.83
Delaware.....	105,237	10,000.00	10,000.00	639.75	10,639.75	10,000.00	1,279.50	10,000.00	1,919.25
Florida.....	533,539	10,000.00	10,000.00	3,243.48	13,243.48	10,000.00	6,486.96	10,000.00	9,730.44
Georgia.....	2,070,471	10,000.00	10,000.00	12,586.74	22,586.74	10,000.00	25,173.48	10,000.00	37,760.22
Idaho.....	255,696	10,000.00	10,000.00	1,554.42	11,554.42	10,000.00	3,108.84	10,000.00	4,663.26
Illinois.....	2,161,662	10,000.00	10,000.00	13,141.12	23,141.12	10,000.00	26,282.24	10,000.00	39,423.36
Indiana.....	1,557,041	10,000.00	10,000.00	9,465.51	19,465.51	10,000.00	18,931.02	10,000.00	28,396.53
Iowa.....	1,544,717	10,000.00	10,000.00	9,390.60	19,390.60	10,000.00	18,781.20	10,000.00	28,171.80
Kansas.....	1,197,159	10,000.00	10,000.00	7,277.73	17,277.73	10,000.00	14,555.46	10,000.00	21,833.19
Kentucky.....	1,734,463	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,544.10	20,544.10	10,000.00	21,088.20	10,000.00	31,632.30
Louisiana.....	1,159,872	10,000.00	10,000.00	7,051.05	17,051.05	10,000.00	14,102.10	10,000.00	21,153.15
Maine.....	360,928	10,000.00	10,000.00	2,194.14	12,194.14	10,000.00	4,388.28	10,000.00	6,582.42
Maryland.....	637,154	10,000.00	10,000.00	3,873.36	13,873.36	10,000.00	7,746.72	10,000.00	11,620.08
Massachusetts.....	241,049	10,000.00	10,000.00	1,465.38	11,465.38	10,000.00	2,930.76	10,000.00	4,396.14
Michigan.....	1,483,129	10,000.00	10,000.00	9,016.20	19,016.20	10,000.00	28,032.40	10,000.00	37,048.60

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION.

Payments to be made annually to each State, based upon the census of 1910, and assuming that the bill becomes a law in the fiscal year 1914—Continued.

1914		1915		1916		1917	
State.	Rural population (census of 1910).	Annual appropriation of \$480,000, of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State (assuming that bill becomes a law in the fiscal year 1914).	Annual appropriation of \$480,000, of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State.	Annual appropriation of \$300,000, in the proportion which its rural population bears to total population of the United States.	Annual appropriation of \$480,000, of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State.	Annual appropriation of \$300,000, making \$600,000 to be paid each State in the proportion which its rural population bears to total population of the United States.	Additional appropriation of \$300,000, making \$900,000 to be paid each State in the proportion which its rural population bears to total population of the United States.
\$1,225,414	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$17,449.48	\$10,000.00	\$21,898.96	\$22,348.44
1,589,803	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	19,664.68	10,000.00	29,329.36	32,348.44
1,894,518	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	21,517.09	10,000.00	33,034.18	38,994.04
242,633	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	11,475.01	10,000.00	12,950.02	14,551.27
881,362	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	15,357.94	10,000.00	10,715.88	14,425.03
68,508	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	416.46	10,000.00	832.92	1,249.38
175,473	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	1,066.71	10,000.00	2,133.42	3,200.13
629,957	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	3,829.62	10,000.00	7,659.24	11,488.86
280,730	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	1,706.61	10,000.00	3,413.22	5,119.83
1,928,120	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	11,721.36	10,000.00	23,442.72	35,164.08
1,887,813	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	11,476.32	10,000.00	22,952.64	34,428.96
513,820	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	3,123.60	10,000.00	6,247.20	9,370.80
1,101,978	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	12,778.26	10,000.00	25,556.52	38,334.78
1,337,000	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	8,127.84	10,000.00	16,255.68	24,383.52
365,705	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	2,223.18	10,000.00	4,446.36	6,669.54
3,034,442	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	18,446.89	10,000.00	36,893.78	44,428.96
17,956	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	109.17	10,000.00	218.34	327.51
1,290,568	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	7,845.57	10,000.00	15,691.14	23,536.71
507,215	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	3,083.43	10,000.00	6,166.86	9,250.29
1,743,744	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	20,600.50	10,000.00	31,201.00	41,801.50

Texas.....	2,958,438	10,000.00	10,000.00	17,984.83	27,984.83	10,000.00	35,969.66	45,969.66	10,000.00	53,954.49	63,954.49
Jtah.....	200,417	10,000.00	10,000.00	1,218.36	1,218.36	10,000.00	2,436.72	12,436.72	10,000.00	3,655.08	13,655.08
Vermont.....	187,013	10,000.00	10,000.00	1,136.88	1,136.88	10,000.00	2,273.76	12,273.76	10,000.00	3,410.64	13,410.64
Virginia.....	1,585,083	10,000.00	10,000.00	9,635.97	19,635.97	10,000.00	19,271.94	29,271.94	10,000.00	28,907.91	38,907.91
Washington.....	536,460	10,000.00	10,000.00	3,261.24	13,261.24	10,000.00	6,522.48	16,522.48	10,000.00	9,783.72	19,783.72
West Virginia.....	992,877	10,000.00	10,000.00	6,035.85	16,035.85	10,000.00	12,071.70	22,071.70	10,000.00	18,107.55	28,107.55
Wisconsin.....	1,329,540	10,000.00	10,000.00	8,082.48	18,082.48	10,000.00	16,164.96	26,164.96	10,000.00	24,247.44	34,247.44
Wyoming.....	102,744	10,000.00	10,000.00	624.60	10,624.60	10,000.00	1,249.20	11,249.20	10,000.00	1,873.80	11,873.80
Total.....	49,348,883	480,000.00	480,000.00	300,000.00	780,000.00	480,000.00	600,000.00	1,080,000.00	480,000.00	900,000.00	1,380,000.00

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION.

Payments to be made annually to each State, based upon the census of 1910, and assuming that the bill becomes a law in the fiscal year 1914—Continued.

	Rural population (census of 1910).	State.	1918		1919		1920		1921		
			Annual appropriation of \$480,000, of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State.	Additional appropriation of \$300,000, making \$1,200,000, to be paid each State in the proportion which its rural population bears to total population of the United States.	Annual appropriation of \$180,000, of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State.	Additional appropriation of \$300,000, making \$1,500,000, to be paid each State in the proportion which its rural population bears to total population of the United States.	Annual appropriation of \$480,000, of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State.	Additional appropriation of \$300,000, making \$1,800,000, to be paid each State in the proportion which its rural population bears to total population of the United States.	Annual appropriation of \$180,000, of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State.	Additional appropriation of \$300,000, making \$2,100,000, to be paid each State in the proportion which its rural population bears to the total population of the United States.	
Alabama.....	1,767,662	\$10,000.00	\$42,983.64	\$53,729.55	\$63,729.55	\$64,475.46	\$74,475.46	\$85,221.37	\$75,221.37	\$10,000.00	\$85,221.37
Arizona.....	141,094	10,000.00	3,430.92	4,288.65	5,146.38	5,146.38	6,035.14	6,004.11	6,004.11	10,000.00	6,004.11
Arkansas.....	1,371,768	10,000.00	33,356.76	43,356.76	51,695.95	51,695.95	60,035.14	58,374.33	58,374.33	10,000.00	58,374.33
California.....	907,810	10,000.00	22,074.96	32,074.96	27,593.70	27,593.70	33,112.44	38,631.18	38,631.18	10,000.00	48,631.18
Colorado.....	394,184	10,000.00	9,585.24	19,585.24	11,981.55	11,981.55	14,377.86	16,774.17	16,774.17	10,000.00	24,377.86
Connecticut.....	114,917	10,000.00	2,794.44	12,794.44	3,493.05	3,493.05	4,191.66	4,191.66	4,191.66	10,000.00	4,890.27
Delaware.....	105,237	10,000.00	2,559.00	3,198.75	3,198.75	3,198.75	3,838.50	4,478.25	4,478.25	10,000.00	14,478.25
Florida.....	533,539	10,000.00	12,973.92	22,973.92	16,217.40	16,217.40	19,460.88	22,704.36	22,704.36	10,000.00	32,704.36
Georgia.....	2,070,471	10,000.00	50,346.96	60,346.96	62,933.70	62,933.70	75,520.44	88,107.18	88,107.18	10,000.00	85,520.44
Idaho.....	255,696	10,000.00	6,217.68	16,217.68	7,772.10	7,772.10	9,326.52	10,880.94	10,880.94	10,000.00	19,326.52
Illinois.....	2,161,662	10,000.00	52,564.48	62,564.48	65,705.60	65,705.60	78,846.72	91,987.84	91,987.84	10,000.00	88,846.72
Indiana.....	1,557,041	10,000.00	37,862.04	47,862.04	47,327.55	57,327.55	56,793.06	66,258.57	66,258.57	10,000.00	56,793.06
Iowa.....	1,544,717	10,000.00	37,562.40	47,562.40	46,953.00	56,953.00	56,343.60	65,734.20	65,734.20	10,000.00	56,343.60
Kansas.....	1,197,159	10,000.00	29,110.92	39,110.92	36,388.65	46,388.65	43,666.38	53,666.38	53,666.38	10,000.00	43,666.38
Kentucky.....	1,734,463	10,000.00	42,176.40	52,176.40	52,720.50	62,720.50	63,264.60	73,264.60	73,264.60	10,000.00	63,264.60
Louisiana.....	1,159,872	10,000.00	28,204.20	38,204.20	10,000.00	35,255.25	45,255.25	42,306.30	52,306.30	10,000.00	49,357.35
Maine.....	360,328	10,000.00	8,776.56	18,776.56	10,000.00	10,970.70	20,970.70	13,164.84	23,164.84	10,000.00	15,358.98
Maryland.....	637,154	10,000.00	15,493.44	25,493.44	10,000.00	19,366.80	29,366.80	23,240.16	33,240.16	10,000.00	25,358.98
Massachusetts.....	241,049	10,000.00	5,861.52	15,861.52	10,000.00	7,326.90	17,326.90	8,792.28	18,792.28	10,000.00	20,257.66
Michigan.....	1,483,129	10,000.00	36,064.80	46,064.80	10,000.00	45,081.00	55,081.00	54,097.20	64,097.20	10,000.00	63,113.40
Minnesota.....	1,225,414	10,000.00	29,797.92	39,797.92	10,000.00	37,247.40	47,247.40	44,696.88	54,696.88	10,000.00	52,146.36
Mississippi.....	1,589,803	10,000.00	38,658.72	48,658.72	10,000.00	48,323.40	58,323.40	57,988.08	67,988.08	10,000.00	67,652.76

Missouri.....	1,894,518	10,000.00	46,068.36	56,068.36	10,000.00	57,585.45	67,585.45	79,102.54	80,000.00	80,619.63
Pennsylvania.....	242,633	10,000.00	5,900.04	15,900.04	10,000.00	7,375.05	17,375.05	18,850.06	10,000.00	20,325.07
Nebraska.....	881,362	10,000.00	21,431.76	31,431.76	10,000.00	26,789.70	36,789.70	42,147.64	10,000.00	47,505.58
Nevada.....	68,508	10,000.00	1,665.84	11,665.84	10,000.00	2,082.30	12,082.30	10,000.00	2,498.76	12,915.22
New Hampshire.....	175,473	10,000.00	4,266.84	14,266.84	10,000.00	5,333.55	15,333.55	16,400.26	10,000.00	17,466.97
New Jersey.....	629,957	10,000.00	15,318.48	25,318.48	10,000.00	19,148.10	29,148.10	22,977.72	10,000.00	26,807.34
New Mexico.....	280,730	10,000.00	6,826.44	16,826.44	10,000.00	8,533.05	18,533.05	10,000.00	10,239.66	11,946.27
New York.....	1,928,120	10,000.00	46,885.44	56,885.44	10,000.00	58,606.80	68,606.80	70,328.16	10,000.00	82,049.52
North Carolina.....	513,820	10,000.00	45,905.28	55,905.28	10,000.00	57,381.60	67,381.60	68,857.92	10,000.00	80,334.24
Ohio.....	2,101,978	10,000.00	12,494.40	22,494.40	10,000.00	15,618.00	25,618.00	28,741.60	10,000.00	31,865.20
Oklahoma.....	1,337,000	10,000.00	61,113.04	61,113.04	10,000.00	63,891.30	73,891.30	76,669.56	10,000.00	89,447.82
Oregon.....	365,763	10,000.00	32,511.36	42,511.36	10,000.00	40,639.20	50,639.20	58,767.04	10,000.00	66,894.88
Texas.....	3,034,442	10,000.00	73,787.56	83,787.56	10,000.00	92,234.45	102,234.45	120,681.34	10,000.00	129,128.23
Utah.....	1,17,956	10,000.00	436.68	10,436.68	10,000.00	545.85	10,545.85	10,655.02	10,000.00	10,764.19
Virginia.....	1,290,568	10,000.00	31,382.28	41,382.28	10,000.00	39,227.85	49,227.85	47,073.42	10,000.00	54,918.99
Washington.....	507,215	10,000.00	12,333.72	22,333.72	10,000.00	15,417.15	25,417.15	28,500.58	10,000.00	21,584.01
West Virginia.....	1,743,744	10,000.00	42,402.00	52,402.00	10,000.00	53,002.50	63,002.50	63,603.00	10,000.00	74,203.50
Wisconsin.....	2,958,438	10,000.00	71,939.32	81,939.32	10,000.00	89,924.15	99,924.15	107,908.98	10,000.00	125,893.81
Wyoming.....	200,417	10,000.00	4,873.44	14,873.44	10,000.00	6,091.80	16,091.80	7,310.16	10,000.00	8,528.52
Total.....	49,348,883	480,000.00	1,200,000.00	1,680,000.00	480,000.00	1,500,000.00	1,980,000.00	1,800,000.00	2,280,000.00	2,580,000.00

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION.

Payments to be made annually to each State, based upon the census of 1910, and assuming that the bill becomes a law in the fiscal year 1914—Continued.

State	Rural population (census of 1910).	1922		1923		1924.		Annually thereafter.	
		Annual appropriation of \$480,000, of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State.	Additional appropriation of \$300,000, making \$2,400,000, to be paid each State in the proportion which its rural population bears to the total population of the United States.	Annual appropriation of \$300,000, making \$2,700,000, to be paid each State in the proportion which its rural population bears to the total population of the United States.	Total.	Annual appropriation of \$480,000, of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State.	Additional appropriation of \$300,000, making \$3,000,000, to be paid each State in the proportion which its rural population bears to the total population of the United States.	Grand total for 10 years, including \$480,000 additional for the first fiscal year (1914), of which \$10,000 is to be paid to each State.	Annual appropriation of \$3,000,000 to be paid each State in the proportion which its rural population bears to the total population of the United States.
Ala.....	1,767,662	\$10,000.00	\$85,967.28	\$96,713.19	\$10,000.00	\$107,459.10	\$701,025.05	\$117,459.10	\$107,459.10
Ariz.....	141,094	10,000.00	6,861.84	10,000.00	7,719.57	17,719.57	8,577.30	18,577.30	8,577.30
Ark.....	1,371,768	10,000.00	66,713.52	76,713.52	75,052.71	85,052.71	93,391.90	93,391.90	93,391.90
Cal.....	907,810	10,000.00	44,149.92	54,149.92	49,668.66	59,668.66	55,187.40	65,187.40	65,187.40
Colo.....	394,184	10,000.00	19,170.48	29,170.48	21,566.79	31,566.79	23,963.10	23,963.10	23,963.10
Conn.....	114,917	10,000.00	5,588.88	15,588.88	10,000.00	6,287.49	16,287.49	6,986.10	6,986.10
Del.....	105,237	10,000.00	5,118.00	10,000.00	5,757.75	15,757.75	6,397.50	16,397.50	6,397.50
Fla.....	533,539	10,000.00	25,947.84	35,947.84	29,191.32	39,191.32	32,434.80	42,434.80	32,434.80
Ga.....	2,070,471	10,000.00	100,693.92	110,693.92	110,693.92	123,280.66	125,867.40	135,867.40	135,867.40
Idaho.....	255,696	10,000.00	12,435.36	22,435.36	10,000.00	13,989.78	10,000.00	15,541.20	15,541.20
Ill.....	2,161,662	10,000.00	105,128.96	115,128.96	118,270.08	128,270.08	131,411.20	141,411.20	131,411.20
Ind.....	1,557,041	10,000.00	75,724.08	85,724.08	85,189.59	95,189.59	94,655.10	104,655.10	94,655.10
Iowa.....	1,544,717	10,000.00	75,124.80	85,124.80	84,515.40	94,515.40	93,906.00	103,906.00	93,906.00
Kans.....	1,197,159	10,000.00	58,221.84	68,221.84	65,499.57	75,499.57	72,777.30	82,777.30	82,777.30
Ky.....	1,734,463	10,000.00	84,352.80	94,352.80	10,000.00	94,896.90	10,000.00	105,441.00	115,441.00
La.....	1,159,872	10,000.00	56,408.40	66,408.40	10,000.00	63,459.45	73,459.45	70,510.50	70,510.50
Me.....	360,928	10,000.00	17,553.12	27,553.12	10,000.00	19,747.26	29,747.26	31,941.40	31,941.40
Md.....	637,154	10,000.00	30,986.88	40,986.88	10,000.00	34,860.24	44,860.24	48,733.60	48,733.60
Mass.....	241,049	10,000.00	11,723.04	10,000.00	13,188.42	23,188.42	10,000.00	14,653.80	14,653.80
Mich.....	1,483,129	10,000.00	82,129.60	10,000.00	91,145.80	10,000.00	90,162.00	100,162.00	100,162.00

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Is not that \$3,000,000 besides the \$10,000 a year?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. \$3,480,000?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes; after the nine years.

Mr. HAWLEY. Why were not the Territories included—Hawaii, for instance?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I am not able to answer that question, Mr. Hawley. The outlying Territories, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam, have never been included in any of these measures for educational work.

Mr. SLOAN. Is Alaska included?

Dr. GALLOWAY. No; these Territories are specifically provided for in the regular appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture by funds appropriated for the Office of Experiment Stations, and the educational affairs of these outlying stations are administered by the Office of Experiment Stations.

Mr. HAWLEY. Do you think that they will be adequately provided for when this bill goes into effect?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes, sir. One of the reasons why they have never been brought within the same category as the States is because there has been some uncertainty as to the permanency of certain types of agriculture at those places. We have, however, a well-established station at Porto Rico, something like \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year being spent, and Hawaii has a well-established station, where about the same amount is spent, while \$35,000 is being spent in Alaska.

Mr. HAWLEY. In your judgment, they will be as well provided for by the Federal Government as the States are in this bill?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes; I think so.

There is a proviso in the third section to which attention should be called. I will read it:

Provided further, That before the beginning of each fiscal year projects setting forth the proposed plans for work to be carried on under this act shall be submitted by the proper officials of each college and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture before the funds herein appropriated shall become available to such college for that fiscal year.

This simply stabilizes the whole work, it would seem, and while it does not place within the Secretary's hands any restrictive power, it does make it practicable to unify the work of having projects submitted and agreed upon before they are actually certified by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Section 4 of the bill provides:

That there shall be in the Department of Agriculture a Director of Cooperative Agriculture Extension Work, to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall report directly to him. The salary of such director shall be such as may be provided for by law from time to time.

It would seem necessary to have in the department an office that would act as the clearing house for the work. It was not deemed necessary or advisable to include in this bill an item for the financing of that office, believing that this could be cared for in the regular appropriation bill for the department. As a matter of fact, the present work of the farmers' cooperative demonstration movement and the farm-management work, if reorganized and readjusted, would fit logically into this place, and it will only be necessary to

have some minor readjustment by the Secretary himself, provided authority is given for the establishment of such an office and such a directorship.

Mr. HAWLEY. It is not necessary to provide for the office force?

Dr. GALLOWAY. No; that will be provided for in the regular department appropriation bill, just as is done in other instances.

Mr. SLOAN. Speaking of the rural population, does it contemplate those living in the country or those living in the country and within municipalities of less than 2,500, which the census seems to classify as rural?

Dr. GALLOWAY. This bill simply follows the practice of the census in that respect.

Mr. SLOAN. The census recognizes municipalities under 2,500 as rural?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Who has jurisdiction of the distribution of funds appropriated under the Morrill Act?

Dr. GALLOWAY. The Secretary of the Treasury has actual jurisdiction, but so far as the Hatch and Adams Acts are concerned, unless the certification is made by the Secretary of Agriculture as to the proper use of those funds, the Secretary of the Treasury will not honor the certificate.

Mr. HAUGEN. Why should not this come under the same?

Dr. GALLOWAY. It does, later on.

Mr. HAUGEN. Why this director? It does not seem necessary to appoint a director.

Dr. GALLOWAY. The director will have very little to do with the funds. The director's work will lie in keeping in touch with the great mass of detail which will necessarily follow the putting into effect of such a bill, in organizing the work, and carrying it through. The funds are specifically provided for in the bill itself, but we will need a clearing house, just as we have a clearing house in the Office of Experiment Stations.

Mr. HAUGEN. As a result, we will have one man in charge of the experiment stations, one man in charge of this work, and whenever it is necessary to look after matters, two men will be sent out in place of one, one from each division?

Dr. GALLOWAY. You may have that for a little while, but the Secretary has already a reorganization in mind and we have all that worked out.

Mr. HAUGEN. Then there will be no extension, but rather a saving along that line. Undoubtedly there is a good deal of duplication of work and expenditure of money on account of duplication in sending out two men to do work one man could do. It seems to me that that is simply duplication of work?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Not at all.

Mr. HAUGEN. There would be two departments or divisions, whatever the agency might be, and each division would send men into the same locality?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I do not look at it that way.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is what it would amount to?

Dr. GALLOWAY. No; we have thrashed that out a good many times before, and I think we have made it plain to the committee that we are not sending out two men to do the same kind of work.

Mr. HAUGEN. Not the same kind, but practically the same, at the same places—work which one man could do. I am not criticizing the department. It is the fault of Congress if the fault of anybody.

Dr. GALLOWAY. What we aim for is a centralization of effort rather than a decentralization of effort.

Mr. HAUGEN. Then, why provide for these additional officers?

Dr. GALLOWAY. How could we handle all this work unless we have such an office?

Mr. HAUGEN. I am absolutely certain that your bureau could handle it as well as an additional bureau, or that the Office of Experiment Stations could. I wish to avoid the additional expense of sending two men to do the work that one man can do.

Dr. GALLOWAY. I do not think that point is well taken. There will be no additional expense. It is absolutely necessary to have a neutral organization to handle this work, because it covers all phases of the work in the Department of Agriculture and in the States.

Mr. HAUGEN. The work is to be handled largely by the States?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes; but, as you understand, the department is now most active and energetic in extension work. It is expending now something like \$900,000 in demonstration work alone, and in order to make that work effective and to coordinate that work it is going to be absolutely necessary to have some coordinating force in the department.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is it all under the Bureau of Plant Industry?

Dr. GALLOWAY. No; it is scattered all through the department.

Mr. HAUGEN. It should not be; it should be in one place.

Dr. GALLOWAY. That is exactly what we are trying to do.

Mr. HAUGEN. Not in this bill?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAUGEN. Not in the sense you have referred to, because you establish a new office.

Dr. GALLOWAY. That office is for the purpose of doing this coordinating work. Now, the overhead charges are greater than they should be, showing an absolute need for a centralization of effort in that direction. The aim of this bill is to bring the demonstration work within proper limits by having a central office in the department that will handle the work and coordinate it with the States. That is the eventual plan.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is a different thing?

Dr. GALLOWAY. We have to lay the foundation for action before the Secretary has authority to act.

Mr. HAUGEN. We always lay the foundation and then spread out; that is the trouble.

Dr. GALLOWAY. I do not see how you could plan a house without laying a foundation, unless you built it in the air.

Mr. HAUGEN. We lay the foundation according to what is expected to be put on the foundation. Am I to understand that the purpose of the bill is to transfer the demonstration and farm-management work from the Bureau of Plant Industry to a certain division under the supervision of this director?

Dr. GALLOWAY. It will eventually result in that.

Mr. HAUGEN. Eventually; but what will the bill do?

Dr. GALLOWAY. The bill will do that.

Mr. HAUGEN. In what way?

Dr. GALLOWAY. It establishes an office to which the Secretary can transfer this other line of work.

Mr. HAUGEN. But you do not transfer it?

Dr. GALLOWAY. We can not do it in this bill; we have to do it somewhere else.

Mr. HAUGEN. You certainly can. There is no limit to the authority of Congress in extending the work or in making the change.

Dr. GALLOWAY. It could be done, but I do not think it should be done in this bill. This is not the place. That is a matter of administrative detail for the Secretary himself to handle. If Congress sees fit to give the Secretary that authority, there will be a large amount of organization which can only be perfected after careful consideration.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think if it is done at all it should be done in this bill. It can not be done in an appropriation bill, because it will be new legislation or changing existing law, therefore subject to a point of order. If that is what is contemplated, here is the place and the only place to do it.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Your point is this, as I understand it, to specify in this bill that all of this demonstration work and this extension work done by the department now and in the future shall be centralized and handled through this office, embodying that phraseology in the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Not exactly that. Instead of expending and providing for new division I would centralize, so as in place of sending six men where one can do the work I would provide for one and save the expenses of five men.

Dr. GALLOWAY. I think our records will show that we do not send six men out to do the work of one man.

Mr. HAUGEN. I do not state that to be the fact. There may not be six, but there may be three, or possibly two. If only two, I would save the expense of one or whatever number possible.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Can the gentleman cite any instance where two men have been sent to do the work of one?

Mr. HAUGEN. If you will search the records, you will find that there is no question about that.

Dr. GALLOWAY. If Mr. Haugen will come down to the department and go over the records of the work and can find a place where we send out two men when one can do the work, we will correct it at once.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am not speaking about your bureau, but I am speaking about the department. Your bureau sends out one man and another bureau sends out another, when the work could all be done by one man. I am not criticizing the department, but I say that the work could be centralized and that there should be cooperation and coordination.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Just now I happen to be without a bureau.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am sure that the bureau of which you were formerly in charge is and always was managed as well as it could be. There is no criticism. This is simply a business proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, Dr. Galloway, you are trying to work out a plan by which you can prevent this so-called duplication of work in the department?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But this bill can not necessarily have anything to do with that?

Dr. GALLOWAY. That is a tremendous piece of work, which is going to take some time. As I started to say several times, the Secretary of Agriculture has these matters under consideration, and we are hoping to present before this committee at the coming session a suggestion or plan for giving the Secretary authority to go ahead and do these things, but it will take some time.

The CHAIRMAN. But you can not expect that authority to be carried in this bill?

Dr. GALLOWAY. No, sir.

Mr. HAUGEN. In other words, this is creating a new office, which practically means a new division or a bureau?

Dr. GALLOWAY. It will not be a new office in one way, and in another way it will. It will do the work that two offices are doing now.

Mr. HAUGEN. There will be three offices doing the work that two offices are doing now. They are doing the work?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I mean under this bill. This is a departure. Work referred to done under appropriation made for the department. This money is to be turned over to the States?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes; through the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is simply to make the apportionment?

Dr. GALLOWAY. And something more than that.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; same as appropriations for the experiment stations, done by the Office of Experiment Stations; why not turn the apportionment over to that office?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Something more than that. This is not to be a post-mortem examination. The Department of Agriculture and the colleges are going to work together, hand in hand, to help the farmers as best they can.

Mr. HAUGEN. In what respect will the apportionment and work differ from that done in the Office of Experiment Stations, so far as the Agricultural Department is concerned?

Dr. GALLOWAY. This bill provides for a mutual understanding between the agricultural colleges and the Secretary, the submittal of projects, and mutual agreement as to projects before the work is inaugurated or put through. That is practically the same system we have now in connection with some of the farm management work, whereby we agree to put a certain amount in a State and the investigational work of the department is placed in the hands of the agricultural colleges.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In the old bill, in section 4, there is a proviso to the effect that 75 per cent of all the moneys appropriated and available under the act shall be expended in a certain way, namely, in actual instruction and demonstration.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There is nothing of that kind in this bill, as I understand. What do you think of that?

Dr. GALLOWAY. That was carefully considered, and it was believed unnecessary to include that proviso. It is in a measure taken care of, I think, a little further along. There are certain things taken

out of the bill that can not be done under this act. The dominant idea here is demonstration.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is what we intend. Is it made clear, though, in the bill? The agricultural colleges are now receiving, and for many years have received, large sums of money, and I think the idea of some was that the money should be expended in outside work, but a very large part of it has been pent within the colleges. The idea now is to furnish money for outside work and to permit its use for no other purpose.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes, sir.

Secretary HOUSTON. Does not section 2 cover that?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I have not examined it carefully, but if it covers it that is all right. It seems to me it ought to be made clear.

Secretary HOUSTON. Look at section 2 from line 14 to line 20.

The CHAIRMAN. Please read that section, so that we may have it in the record.

Dr. GALLOWAY (reading):

SEC. 2. That cooperative agricultural extension work shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics to persons not attending or resident in said colleges in the several communities, and imparting to such persons information on said subjects through field demonstrations, publications, and otherwise, and this work shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture, or his representative, and the State agricultural college or colleges receiving the benefits of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The old bill provided that 75 per cent of this money should be used for actual field demonstrations, but section 2 of this bill does not set out the money to be used for that purpose, and I think that is what Mr. McLaughlin is getting at.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. This section provides that it shall all be used for field instruction and practical demonstrations.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes.

Mr. RUBEY. In addition to that, section 6 provides a limitation on the expenditures and enumerates the things for which this money shall not be spent.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Taking section 6 and section 2 together, section 6, by a process of exclusion, sets out certain things that can not be done, and it practically limits all of the work to these demonstrations, home economics, etc. Now, that matter was considered when this bill was redrafted, and it was believed that the predominant work should be demonstration work and that it could be adjusted and handled through mutual understandings on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture and the presidents or deans of the colleges.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. You are in sympathy with the idea of taking this work out to the farmers and those who are not able to attend the colleges?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Absolutely.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I have always understood that you were in sympathy with that idea, and you think that this bill as now drawn properly safeguards that?

Dr. GALLOWAY. I do; and I think if allowed a little elasticity that it will make it practicable for the Secretary of Agriculture to more energetically take this work out to all the people and directly help the farmer on his own farm. Perhaps in this connection it might be well to call attention to a matter which was before the last meeting

of the Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations held at Atlanta. At that time the committee had under consideration this question of extension work, in fact, the association has had under consideration this extension work for a number of years, and from time to time has made reports, as some of you gentlemen are aware. At this meeting the committee brought forward a report which quite clearly defined extension work, or attempted to do so, and then brought forward some arguments as to the necessity for this work and its object. I do not know that it is necessary to read this entire statement, but I would like, Mr. Chairman, to put it in the record at this point. I think it would be of value because it brings out the very question propounded by Mr. McLaughlin.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record.

(Said report follows:)

The committee appointed by the Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations to consider the whole question of extension service in its relation to helping the farmer groups its general work in extension service under three heads: (1) Systematic instruction, (2) informal teaching, and (3) organization of rural communities. Under each of these heads are several subheads dealing with such questions as the movable school, the correspondence course, the lecture and reading course, the study club, boys' and girls' clubs, conventions and lectures, farmers' institutes and farmers' week, farmers' conferences, demonstrations, railway specials, exhibitions, educational excursions, etc. The committee, commenting on this outline, says:

"This type of work is so fundamental in its relationship to agricultural prosperity that no student of the situation can but be convinced that the work itself must expand largely and go on for all time. The only question is, Who is going to do it? Is it to be the agricultural colleges or are other agencies to perform it?"

"It is true that there are those who say that we can not hope to reach the hundredth man on the farm; that the most we can do is to train leaders at the colleges, and then through agricultural departments of high schools and such means as the agricultural press, various agricultural societies, etc., let the modern knowledge percolate down as far as it may."

"Your committee believes that this doctrine is essentially undemocratic. We believe that the attempt should be made to reach the last man on the land, not primarily because of a sentimental regard for that last unfortunate man, but because it is absolutely essential in the conservation of soil resources that the intelligence of soil tillers be conserved."

"The land in America devoted to agriculture is in the hands of some seven or eight million different men. A large proportion of these men are owners of the land, who have the power to determine whether the land shall be used properly or whether its fertility shall be encroached upon. They can not be compelled by law to take proper care of their land. They will care for it properly only as they are educated to the level of an appreciation of the importance of right farming to themselves and to their posterity."

"There is another element in the situation. The character of our agricultural population is constantly changing. The foreigner, ignorant of our language and often ignorant of the best types of farming, is gradually crowding out the old American farmer. In other words, we have a perpetually flowing current of new soil workers that must be brought to understand the best methods of farming."

"And then, too, we are making such rapid strides in our knowledge of agricultural science that even the graduates of agricultural schools and colleges will need to continue their studies. The time is coming when the extension service of the agricultural college will devote a considerable portion of its time to correspondence—teaching the better educated farmers, who will avail themselves of this opportunity to keep themselves abreast of the times. This suggests that even if the attempt to reach the great masses of the farmers be given over to other agencies, the extension service of the agricultural college could find ample scope for its energies in the higher forms of extension teaching."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Is it not true that the college men, and, perhaps, the gentlemen connected with your bureau, consider lectures and institutes as extension work?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes; that is considered extension work by the colleges.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. But the idea of this bill is to go farther and to do a different kind of work from that?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Oh, yes; in fact, I think that everybody connected with the college work in the department is beginning to recognize that the influence of the farmers' institute is on the wane, that the people will have to be reached in some other way, and that the institute has had its day.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Suppose some authority in an agricultural college, directing the use of the money at that end of the line, should think that institutes are still a good thing and that by lectures they could reach the people as they ought to be reached, and would choose to spend a lot of money in that way instead of employing men to go right on the farms and meet the farmers, is there any check on that in this bill?

Dr. GALLOWAY. The check would come through the Secretary of Agriculture in the handling of these projects.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In one of the sections there is a provision that there shall be a conference at the beginning of the year—I do not remember just how it reads—to lay out the work of the following year, or to determine how the money shall be expended, but there is no authority vested in your department to direct the expenditure of the money as determined at the conference.

Mr. GALLOWAY. No; but it provides for the submittal of projects, the same as is the case with the Adams Act.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Who shall adopt and pass upon them?

Dr. GALLOWAY. The Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And has he authority to see that they are carried out just as they are accepted?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes; that is provided in section 2.

Mr. HAWLEY. If they vary in any way they endanger the next year's appropriation, do they not?

Dr. GALLOWAY. If the Secretary should decline to approve the project, of course the certificates to the Secretary of the Treasury, as provided in section 5, would not go forward, and they would receive no money.

Mr. HAWLEY. And if they misused the money one year, until the State made it good, they would lose the money for the next year—that is, they have to replace the money that has been misused?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, they can not use any money at all until the Department of Agriculture and the colleges have agreed upon a plan or plans? Is not that true under section 2 of the bill?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes; that is true.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It goes a little farther than that and is a little better than I thought from a casual reading of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Section 3 covers that, too.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes; beginning with line 20.

Dr. GALLOWAY. That section provides:

That before the beginning of each fiscal year projects setting forth the proposed plans for work to be carried on under this act shall be submitted by the proper officials of each college and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture before the funds herein appropriated shall become available to such college for that fiscal year.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is better than I thought it was from a casual reading of the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. The Federal Government under this bill will exercise absolute power and control over this appropriation and will have the right to say what particular project shall be carried out after the appropriation has been made. Now, what will the State rights people say? Are we not likely to encounter some difficulties along that line?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Perhaps that question had better be propounded to the gentlemen themselves.

Mr. HAUGEN. You have had experience. This matter has been under consideration by you for some time, and that is the reason why I ask you.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Well, there will be no trouble whatever, because it is simply a matter of mutual relations.

Mr. HAUGEN. You are aware of the fact that there is a great deal of opposition to the bill on that ground? You are aware of the fact that there are still States rights people in the United States?

Dr. GALLOWAY. There was considerable opposition, but I believe that when it is fully understood what the aims and objects of this bill are and what this bill intends to carry through that that opposition will amount to very little. I think there is absolutely no question but that with the proper handling of the matter here at the department we can establish the most friendly and cordial relations with all the States. We have never had any difficulty.

Mr. HAUGEN. You have never had any difficulty in regard to other appropriations?

Dr. GALLOWAY. No; it is just a question of relationships.

Dr. THOMPSON. I would like to read a word or two from Dean Russell on that very point [reading]:

(3) That part of the proposed modification under section 3, which relates to the formulation of distinct projects at the beginning of each fiscal year, setting forth the plans of the work to be carried on under this act, submitted by the proper officials of each college, and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, is, in my judgment, a most excellent provision. For the last year or so I have had in mind the marked desirability of transferring our extension service work onto a project basis, the same as is done with our Adams experiments. The working out of a specific project prior to the inauguration of any line of work means thoroughness of detail with reference to the plan and economy in administration. This I regard as a most valuable improvement. I take it that the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture will only relate to whether or not it is a rational and suitable project to be submitted under the extension funds. If this matter is handled with the same degree of tact and reasonableness that the Hatch and Adams funds have been handled, I see no particular objection thereto.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Whose opinion is that?

Dr. THOMPSON. Dean Russell, of the University of Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Galloway, suppose you take the remaining sections and compare them with the old bill. Then we will ask the Secretary of Agriculture to make a general statement.

Dr. GALLOWAY. I had reached section 4 and we had discussed that section. Section 5 merely indicates the manner in which the funds shall be paid—that is, by certificates from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Treasury. It is not necessary that we discuss that section very fully.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not different from the old bill?

Dr. GALLOWAY. It is not different from the old bill. In section 6 there is no material change from the old bill. That section simply

makes provision for the loss or misapplication of any of the funds. It is identical with the old bill, and that clause has been very carefully worked out by officials in the Treasury Department and our department, and I think can be passed over without further comment.

The CHAIRMAN. That section is also identical with the present law, is it not—that is, with reference to the Adams Act?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes; the same as the Hatch Act, but it is more closely comparable with the Adams Act, which is believed to be better than the Hatch Act. Section 7 is a still further elucidation of the methods of payment, simply giving the necessary phraseology of the manner in which the legislatures are expected to act in case of the loss of funds or the misapplication of funds. Section 8 provides merely that each year the Secretary of Agriculture shall make an annual report to Congress of the receipts and expenditures in connection with this bill.

In order that the differences between the original bill and the proposed modification may be clearly set forth I desire to introduce into the record copies of the bills side by side, so that a comparison for the purpose of showing just where the differences exist may be readily made. The original bill as passed by the House of Representatives will be found in the right-hand column, the proposed modification in the center column, and an analysis of the proposed changes and comments will be found in the third column of the accompanying statement.

COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK.

ORIGINAL BILL INTRODUCED BY MR. LEVER.

PROPOSED MODIFICATION.

A BILL To establish agricultural extension departments in connection with agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and of acts supplementary thereto.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same, there may be inaugurated in connection with the college or colleges in each State now receiving, or which may hereafter receive, the benefits of the act of Congress approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, entitled, "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," and of acts supplementary thereto, at department to be known and designated as an agricultural extension department: *Provided*, That in any State in which two or more such colleges have been or hereafter may be established the appropriations hereinafter made to such State shall be direct.

A BILL To provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same, there may be inaugurated in connection with the college or colleges in each State now receiving, or which may hereafter receive, the benefits of the act of Congress approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, entitled, "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts" (Twelfth Statutes at Large, page five hundred and three), and of the act of Congress approved August thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety (Twenty-sixth Statutes at Large, page four hundred and seventeen), agricultural extension work which shall be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That in any State in which two or more such colleges have been or hereafter may be established the appropriations hereinafter made to such State shall be

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED CHANGES AND COM-
MENTS.

The words, "agricultural extension departments," have been changed throughout the modified form of bill to "cooperative agricultural extension work" and the cooperative nature of the work as between the colleges and the department emphasized.

In the original bill no provision was made for cooperation between the various State agricultural colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture, although the work which would naturally be carried on would closely parallel that for which Congress now makes large annual appropriations, namely, the farmers' cooperative demonstration work and the farm-management work.

Under the modified form of bill, all the extension and demonstration work carried on by the State agencies, as well as by the department in the various States, can be correlated and unified and the expenditure of the public funds more efficiently and economically administered, and better results secured.

As many of the State agricultural colleges already have extension departments, or the necessary machinery for conducting extension work, or at least have authority to conduct such work, there does not seem to be any necessity for the establishment of distinct extension departments as is provided for in the original bill.

No material change in the first part of this section has been made, except that the word

administered by such college or colleges as the legislature of such State may direct.

"established" has been changed to "inaugurated."

More specific reference is made to the acts establishing and extending the agricultural colleges in order to prevent confusion.

Specific provision is made that the work shall be carried on cooperatively between the colleges and the department.

The provision for the establishment of "extension," departments is omitted, it being understood that the colleges which will avail themselves of the benefits of this act are already prepared or have the necessary authority to conduct such work.

Provision is here made for the conduct of the work in a manner mutually satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture and the agricultural colleges, which makes reference to the present demonstration work of the department unnecessary. This paragraph is also made to conform with section one, no mention being made of extension departments in the colleges.

No attempt is made to define the exact methods which shall be used for imparting information except that "field demonstrations" are mentioned. Later in the bill there is a prohibition against lectures at colleges or the promotion of agricultural trains. The procedure to be followed in the different States will be such as will best serve the particular needs of each section of the country.

In view of the fact that the work is to be conducted in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture and the correspondence and literature relating to the work can be sent out under the department frank, this section does not seem necessary. The department is now conducting a great

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION.

SEC. 2. That cooperative agricultural extension work shall consist of the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics to persons not attending or resident in said colleges in the several communities, and imparting to such persons information on said subjects through field demonstrations, publications, and otherwise; and this work shall be carried on in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture or his representative and the State agricultural college or colleges receiving the benefits of this act.

Provided, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to interfere with either the demonstration of farm-management work as now conducted by the Department of Agriculture and known as the farmers' cooperative demonstration work and farm-management work.

(Section three of the original bill introduced by Mr. Lever has been omitted from the proposed modification for the reasons indicated.)

SEC. 3. That all correspondence for the furtherance of the purposes of this act issued from the agricultural colleges to their agents or by the agents of the said extension departments thereof receiving the benefits of this act shall be transmitted in the mails of the United States free of charge for postage under such

regulations as the Postmaster General from time to time may prescribe.

SEC. 4. That for the purpose of paying the necessary expenses of maintaining said agricultural extension departments and printing and distributing information on agriculture and home economics, as hereinbefore prescribed, and for otherwise carrying out the provisions of this act, the sum of \$10,000 shall be, and hereby is, annually appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each State which shall thereafter provide, to each State which shall by action of its legislature assent to the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That payment of such installments of the appropriation hereinbefore made as shall become due to any State before the adjournment of the regular session of the legislature meeting next after the passage of this act shall be made upon the assent of the governor thereof, duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That the additional sum of \$300,000 shall be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and fourteen, to be paid as hereinafter provided, and an annual increase of the amount of such appropriation thereafter for nine years by an additional sum of \$300,000 over the preceding year, and the annual additional sum to be paid thereafter to the States shall be \$3,000,000, to be used only for the purposes hereinbefore stated; these

SEC. 3 (4). That for the purpose of paying the expenses of said cooperative agricultural extension work and the necessary printing and distributing of information in connection with the same, there is permanently appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$480,000 for each year, \$10,000 of which shall be paid annually, in the manner hereinafter provided, to each State which shall by action of its legislature assent to the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That payment of such installments of the appropriation hereinbefore made as shall become due to any State before the adjournment of the regular session of the legislature meeting next after the passage of this act shall be made upon the assent of the governor thereof, duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That there is also appropriated an additional sum of \$300,000 for the fiscal year following that in which the foregoing appropriation first becomes available, and for each year thereafter for nine years a sum exceeding by \$300,000 the sum appropriated for each preceding year, and for each year thereafter there is permanently appropriated for each year the additional sum of \$3,000,000: *Provided further*, That before the beginning of each fiscal year projects setting forth the proposed plans for work to be car-

deal of cooperative work similar to that provided for in this bill in connection with its farm-management demonstration work, and the department frank is used, the cooperative nature of the work being shown on the literature and stationery.

The funds provided for in the modified section are identical with those provided in the original bill. The appropriating words are changed slightly in the interest of clearness.

A table showing the maximum amount payable to each State for each year under the provisions of the bill is attached.

The clause which has been added providing for approval of the work by the Secretary of Agriculture will insure a correlative of the work and uniformity in the extension work throughout the country.

The provision that not less than seventy-five per centum of all moneys available under the act shall be expended for field instruc-

tions and demonstrations has been omitted from the proposed modification of the bill, it being considered unnecessary in view of the added provision for the approval of the work contemplated by the various States by the Secretary of Agriculture.

additional sums to be allotted annually to each State in the proportion which its rural population bears to the total rural population of all the States, as determined by the next preceding Federal census: *Provided further*, That no State shall be entitled to any part of its allotment of these additional sums unless its legislature has heretofore provided or until it shall provide for the establishment of an agricultural extension department in its college or colleges receiving the benefits of this act, and the additional amount to be paid in any year to any State under this act shall be a sum not exceeding the sum appropriated for that year by the legislature of such State or provided by State, county, college, or local authority for the maintenance of said agricultural extension departments: *And provided further*, That in each State which shall assent to the provisions of this act there shall be expended each year for field instruction and demonstrations not less than seventy-five percentum of all moneys available under the provisions of this act.

ried on under this act shall be submitted by the proper officials of each college and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture before the funds herein appropriated shall become available to such college for that fiscal year. Such additional sums shall be used only for the purposes hereinbefore stated and shall be allotted annually to each State by the Secretary of Agriculture and paid in the manner hereinbefore provided in the proportion which the rural population of each State bears to the total rural population of all the States, as determined by the next preceding Federal census: *Provided*, That no payment out of the additional appropriations herein provided shall be made in any year to any State until an equal sum has been appropriated for that year by the legislature of such State, or provided by State, county, college, or local authority for the maintenance of cooperative agricultural extension work.

SEC. 4. That there shall be in the Department of Agriculture a Director of Cooperative Agricultural Extension Work, to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture and report directly to him. The salary of such director shall be such as may be provided for by law from time to time.

In order to provide a central agency to direct the extension work, this provision, not contained in the original bill, has been added. Such a Director of Extension Work would be directly responsible to the Secretary of Agriculture and would be his representative in dealing with the colleges. His salary and other expenses would be included in the annual appropriation bill of the department.

It would seem highly essential that there should be such an officer, who should be thoroughly trained and experienced in extension and demonstration work and possess a high degree of tact in order to promote and

SEC. 5. That whenever it shall appear to the Secretary of the Treasury from the annual statement of receipts and expenditures of any of said agricultural extension departments that a portion of the preceding annual appropriation remains unexpended, such amount shall be deducted from the next succeeding annual appropriation for such agricultural extension department, in order that the amount of money appropriated for any agricultural extension department shall not exceed the amount actually required for its maintenance and support.

(Section 5 of the original bill has been omitted from the proposed modification for the reasons indicated.)

maintain cordial relations with the colleges. The employment of such an officer who would be in touch with extension work all over the country, would insure the dissemination of those extension principles and practices which are proving to be the most effective in reaching the farmer on his own farm and the elimination of effort along lines which are not productive of results.

Section 5 of the original bill has been entirely omitted. With such a provision the tendency would be to expend the entire appropriation each year, whether the needs of the work required it or not, knowing that if the appropriation was not entirely expended that the appropriation for the following year would be reduced by the amount not so expended. The result in many cases, no doubt, would be a waste or at least an uneconomical use of the public funds. As all of the money not expended during the year for which it is appropriated reverts to the Treasury in any event and as circumstances might arise which would make it impossible to properly expend the entire appropriation in a particular year because of resignations or other causes, while the entire fund might be urgently needed the following year, it is not believed advisable to have such a provision embodied in the bill.

Section 5 of the proposed modification is identical with section 6 of the original bill introduced by Mr. Lever.

SEC. 5 (4). That the sums hereby appropriated for extension work shall be annually paid in equal semianual payments on the first day of January and July of each year by the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the warrant of the Secretary of Agriculture, out of the Treasury of the United States, to the treasurer or

other officer of the State duly authorized by the laws of the State to receive the same; and such officer shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture, on or before the first day of September of each year, a detailed statement of the amount so received during the previous fiscal year, and of its disbursement, on forms prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sec. 7. That if any portion of the moneys received by the designated officer of any State for the support and maintenance of agricultural extension departments, as provided in this act, shall by any action or contingency be diminished or lost, or be misappropriated, it shall be replaced by said State to which it belongs, and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to said State and no portion of said moneys shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or the purchase or rental of land, or in college course teaching, lectures in colleges, promoting agricultural trains, or any other purpose not specified in this act, and not more than five per centum of each annual appropriation shall be applied to the printing and distribution of publications. It shall be the duty of each of said colleges annually, on or before the first day of January, to make to the governor of the State in which it is located a full and detailed report of its operations in the direction of extension work as defined in this act, including a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures from all sources for this purpose, a copy of which report shall be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

or other officer of the State duly authorized by the laws of the State to receive the same; and such officer shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture, on or before the first day of September of each year, a detailed statement of the amount so received during the previous fiscal year, and of its disbursement, on forms prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

No material change except to substitute the word "work" for "departments" and to add the word "cooperative," in order to make this paragraph conform to the rest of the bill.

Sec. 6 (7). That if any portion of the moneys received by the designated officer of any State for the support and maintenance of cooperative agricultural extension work, as provided in this act, shall by any action or contingency be diminished or lost, or be misappropriated, it shall be replaced by said State to which it belongs, and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to said State and no portion of said moneys shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or the purchase or rental of land, or in college course teaching, lectures in colleges, promoting agricultural trains, or any other purpose not specified in this act, and not more than five per centum of each annual appropriation shall be applied to the printing and distribution of publications. It shall be the duty of each of said colleges annually, on or before the first day of January, to make to the governor of the State in which it is located a full and detailed report of its operations in the direction of extension work as defined in this act, including a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures from all sources for this purpose, a copy of which report shall be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

Sec. 8. That on or before the first day of July in each year after the passage of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall ascertain and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury as to each State whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation for agricultural extension departments under this act and the amount which thereupon each is entitled, respectively, to receive. If the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold a certificate from any State of its appropriation, the facts and reasons therefor shall be reported to the President, and the amount involved shall be kept separate in the Treasury until the expiration of the Congress next succeeding a session of the legislature of any State from which a certificate has been withheld, in order that the State may, if it should so desire, appeal to Congress from the determination of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid, it shall be covered into the Treasury. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby charged with the proper administration of this law.

Sec. 9. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall make an annual report to Congress of the receipts and expenditures and work of the agricultural extension departments in all of the States receiving the benefits of this act, and also whether the appropriation of any State has been withheld; and if so, the reasons therefor.

Sec. 10. That Congress may at any time alter, amend, or repeal any or all of the provisions of this act.

Sec. 7 (8). That on or before the first day of July in each year after the passage of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall ascertain and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury as to each State whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation for cooperative agricultural extension work under this act and the amount which it is entitled, respectively, to receive. If the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold a certificate from any State of its appropriation, the facts and reasons therefor shall be reported to the President, and the amount involved shall be kept separate in the Treasury until the expiration of the Congress next succeeding a session of the legislature of any State from which a certificate has been withheld, in order that the State may, if it should so desire, appeal to Congress from the determination of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid, it shall be covered into the Treasury.

Sec. 8(9). That the Secretary of Agriculture shall make an annual report to Congress of the receipts, expenditures, and results of the cooperative agricultural extension work in all of the States receiving the benefits of this act, and also whether the appropriation of any State has been withheld; and if so, the reasons therefor.

Sec. 9(10). That Congress may at any time alter, amend, or repeal any or all of the provisions of this act.

No change in wording, except to substitute word "work" for "departments." The sentence "And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby charged with the proper administration of this law," is omitted in view of previous provision placing the duty upon him each year of approving all projects or plans for work before the funds can be used by the colleges.

No material change, except in phraseology to conform to the rest of bill. Reference to extension "departments" omitted.

No change.

Dr. GALLOWAY. It may be proper to submit a memorandum showing the tentative suggestions agreed to by the Committee of the Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture in relation to the general subject of closer relationships on the part of the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural colleges and experiment stations of the several States.

(The memorandum referred to by Dr. Galloway and letters accompanying it follow:)

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY,
Columbus, May 19, 1913.

Hon. DAVID F. HOUSTON,
Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I submit herewith the typewritten statement of the final draft of the suggestions discussed at the conference last Saturday with the executive committee. This is submitted to you for amendment and further suggestions as may seem desirable to you. The committee tried to include all the items in the discussion that seemed to be of importance but may have omitted some, and in that case we shall be very much pleased to have you complete the statement.

If you will have the kindness to render this service and return a copy to me with your approval, I shall then, as suggested in the conference, prepare copies and forward them to the several colleges and stations as information. I should not do this, of course, without your approval.

With renewed appreciation of your kindness to the committee and to myself in person at the recent meeting, I have the honor to remain,

Yours, very truly,

W. O. THOMPSON.

TENTATIVE SUGGESTIONS AGREED TO BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES AND EXPERIMENT STATIONS AFTER CONSULTATION WITH THE HONORABLE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

The executive committee of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations desires to express to the honorable Secretary of Agriculture its great gratification at the attitude of his department in its effort to bring about a closer and more efficient relationship between the work of the department and that of the colleges and experiment stations.

(1) The executive committee heartily indorses the suggestion of the Secretary that as a means of inaugurating and perpetuating an intelligent and sympathetic cooperation of these agencies there be established a permanent committee on the general relations of the department and the colleges, said committee to be made up of representatives from both the department and the association.

RESEARCH.

(1) The executive committee cordially agrees with the point of view of the Secretary that the primary function of the Federal department is to undertake the study of problems that are more particularly regional, interstate, and international in character, and that upon the station should rest the responsibility of investigating the problems that arise within their respective States.

This general policy is not to debar a union effort by the department and a given station in the study of a problem whenever it becomes evident that such cooperation is necessary or will tend to a more successful outcome.

(2) Whenever the department finds it desirable to study a problem within a given State, harmonious relations and an intelligent understanding would undoubtedly be promoted by a consultation between the department and the State's station prior to its inauguration. In case the station is unable to cooperate in the work, or does not desire to do so, it should lend sympathetic and advisory support.

(3) Unqualified approval is given to the proposal of the Secretary that in order to assist in the carrying out of the policy of cooperation there be organized a joint committee on the correlation of research, to be made up of representatives from the department and the college and station association, one function of said committee to be the preparation for early publication by the department of a list of scientific projects to be undertaken by both the department and the stations. This committee should also be empowered to assist in any feasible way in correlating the work of the

National and State research agencies in such manner as shall promote efficiency in securing results.

(4) Equally emphatic approval is given to the plan of holding group conferences between the scientific specialists of the department and the stations. It would seem desirable and perhaps necessary that owing to financial conditions within the association and stations the necessary expenses of such conferences should be met from a fund administered by the department.

(5) It seems to be mutually agreed that in order to make available to students of science the research work of the department and stations and to promote its standing in the scientific world there should be published by the department a journal of agricultural research, such journal to contain only those contributions from the department and stations as are viséed by the committee selected for that purpose.

EXTENSION.

The executive committee approves the policy of unifying the administration of the extension service and is desirous of assisting in securing Federal legislation to that end on the basis of the following principles and conditions:

(a) That the extension service shall be administered wholly under the immediate direction of the college of agriculture. State leaders of extension service shall be appointed by said colleges and shall be recognized as college officials.

(b) That extension-service projects maintained by Federal funds shall be entered upon only after mutual approval by the department and the colleges.

(c) That the funds to be applied to the maintenance of the extension service shall be secured through congressional appropriations made to the Federal department, to be distributed by it to the several States as provided by law on the basis of the fundamental provisions embodied in the Lever bill (H. R. 1692).

(d) It is understood that the appropriations made for extension service by the several States shall be under their control.

(e) It is further understood that the (Federal) moneys appropriated to extension service shall all be expended under the plans and agreements mutually approved by the department and colleges, and that no outside cooperative arrangement for maintaining extension service shall be made with any corporation or commercial body, excepting as a corporation or commercial body may wish to donate funds to be administered in extension service exclusively by the colleges of agriculture in consultation with the department.

MAY 26, 1913.

Prof. W. O. THOMPSON,
President Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR PRESIDENT THOMPSON: I have your recent note, together with the draft of suggestions looking toward bringing about closer relationships between the department and the college and stations. The suggestions are approved, although there are a few slight changes in the phraseology that might be just as well added later, after further discussion with your committee.

In view of the department's relations with the general education board, I would suggest that the words "corporation or" be omitted from the last paragraph, lines 6 and 7. This will limit the application of the paragraph to commercial bodies only. In view of our contract with the general education board, I would be pleased to consider further the relations of this work to that of the colleges at our next meeting. I have no doubt that satisfactory conclusions can be reached whereby all of the extension service may be handled through the colleges, where it seems to me it properly belongs.

With kindest regards, I am,
Yours, sincerely,

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary.*

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you, sir; and if no member of the committee has any questions, we will hear from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Before the Secretary begins his statement, I would like to say that I have not printed the statement that Dr. Galloway has been reading from, because I thought it better to print it with these hearings and make it a part of the entire proposition, and with the consent of the committee I will add it to Dr. Galloway's statement, so you will have the two together.

STATEMENT OF HON. DAVID F. HOUSTON, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

Secretary HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I think perhaps this matter might clear itself in the minds of some of the members if we made plain at the outset just what this bill intends to accomplish. Both the Department of Agriculture and the State colleges have many departments or bureaus, as you know. For many years they have been making investigations in an effort to discover things that will be helpful to farmers. For many years they have been trying to make known to the farmers what they have discovered. I think the greatest achievement the colleges have made, perhaps, is in the matter of discovering information, but the greatest difficulty they have encountered is in getting the information to the farmers and in inducing farmers to apply that information. I suppose the gentlemen from the land-grant colleges—and some of you, perhaps, know that I had the good fortune at one time to be connected with such a college—will agree with me that the most difficult undertaking is to get information to the farmers, and, if I may use the word, make them apply it. Personally I do not feel we have been very successful in that, especially with the small farmers in remote districts, the very men we ought to reach, and it seems to me that is one of the great problems confronting the agricultural colleges and the Department of Agriculture to-day. I imagine that if we could get all that we now know, all that these departments know, and all that the best farmers know to the farmers that are not especially informed and successful, we could revolutionize this Nation.

Now, it is rather idle to spend millions of dollars to discover things if we do not get those discoveries to the farmers and induce the farmers to apply the information.

The agencies for reaching the farmers have not been exceptionally efficient. We have various agencies. We have the press, general and special; we have the bulletins. Now, there is no need of pointing out to you gentlemen that many farmers do not get these bulletins, do not read them if they get them, do not understand them if they read them, and do not apply them if they understand them. You know that the personal message is more effective than the printed message, but the personal message, in the form of lectures, is not especially efficient. We have discovered that the farmers' institute is not the most efficient way of reaching the people. It has been ascertained that the actual demonstration of a thing is the most effective. A farmer is rather prejudiced; he is conservative and rather hard-headed. He is a man of sense and wants to be shown, and he is skeptical until he is shown. If you can take his farm and show that things can be done on it differently from the way in which he is doing those things, if results can be secured, then he is likely to follow. That seems to have been the conclusion from the demonstration work that the Federal Government and the State departments of agriculture have undertaken. Personally I know to-day of no better way of reaching the farmers than through this demonstration process.

If it is wise and legal for the Federal Government and State governments to undertake to secure this information, it certainly ought to be legal and wise to undertake to get it to the farmers in the most

efficient manner. It seems to me that the Federal department ought to have machinery to get this information to the farmers and that the State institutions ought to have efficient machinery to get whatever information they have to the farmers. Now, we are getting it to the same people, and if each is going his own way he is going to do a double task and is going to duplicate very needlessly. Therefore, it has seemed to me exceptionally wise that we should adopt the closest sort of relations, not only in this business of getting information to the farmers but discovering information for the farmers.

I saw when I was at the State college of Texas, and I see now, that there is some waste; that there is some duplication of effort in both fields—in the field of investigation and in the field of information. There has not been the closest coordination of effort. In some communities the neither of two sets of institutions knows what the other is doing. They are sometimes working on the same problem without knowledge of that fact, when one of them could attack that problem with the assistance of the other.

I think I shall not make any unfair criticism of both departments when I say that they have not always carefully planned either their investigations or their dissemination of information, and with reference to the specific thing in mind and with reference to what the other agencies have been doing, this thing being relatively new, it is not singular that it should not have been perfectly done. The Department of Agriculture has discovered, after a long period, that the best way to secure carefully considered plans is to have projects carefully considered and formulated and then systematically executed. The colleges are coming to the same conclusion. Now, it so happens that there has been no arrangement by which the Department of Agriculture could know just what projects the colleges had in mind, and the colleges did not know just what projects the department had in mind or what projects other colleges had in mind, and we have been discussing with the executive committee of the land-grant colleges whether it would not be feasible for each of these institutions to have in hand projects, formulated every year, by which all the institutions, Federal and State, can work together. You can easily see how that would clear the air. The same thing applies to the information side of it. Each has been going its own road, and I think unquestionably the most admirable feature of this bill is that in this field it will bring these agencies together and make them work with a single mind—they are working for the same people—with the minimum of waste and with the maximum of care. By the careful formation of plans the two will work together and execute the plans in a way that will be most advantageous.

Section 2 of the bill defines the kind of information and the method and manner of giving out this information. Under a subsequent section—

The CHAIRMAN. Section 6.

Secretary HOUSTON. Yes; under section 6, at the bottom of page 5, it is provided that plans shall be agreed on before the money is spent.

Now, I know that in Texas—I would not say the same is true of other States, because I do not know—our investigators very often undertook work that was haphazard and had not been carefully considered. The money was there; they were expected to spend it, and they spent it. If they had been forced to propose a project that was

carefully thought out before a cent was expended the State would have gotten better results. The same thing was true of their attempts to give information. Somebody would come along, some railway company, and say, "Let us have a farmers' institute," and they had a farmers' institute, but there was no well-devised plan. You can see exactly the same thing in this other field. The department is to give information; the colleges are to give information, and there is no reason why they should not cooperate in giving the information that they separately secure or secure in cooperation.

I believe that there is the key to the whole matter, and the most admirable feature of it is that provision which requires them to set their heads together to devise a plan for getting this information to the farmers and have an agreement beforehand. And I can not see any possible danger of the invasion of anybody's rights. If it is legal and wise for the Federal Government to make an appropriation to be used in cooperation with the States, it certainly is legal and wise for the Federal Government to take pains to see that that money is expended for the interests of the people. And that is all this provision does. The only question that could be raised, it seems to me, as to the concentration of power or legality is whether or not the Federal Government ought to appropriate the money. It does not seem to me that any question can be raised as to the wisdom and necessity of this matter after the money has been appropriated.

Now, as to the machinery. As I interpret the act, it contemplates that each State shall devise its own machinery, shall have something like an office for extension or demonstration work, and shall have its staff of workers who shall reach every farmer in that State. Now, it goes without saying that a State institution ought to be able to get into more intimate and easy touch with the farmers in its own State than the Federal department can possibly do.

Therefore, it seems to me wise that provision should be made that the State shall develop this machinery. But the Federal Government has a responsibility. In the first place, it has information that it wants to give out; in the second place, the Federal Government proposes to make an appropriation, and it is desirable that it should have machinery to see that that is carefully and wisely expended, and it does not seem to me to be wise and adequate to provide merely that after the money is expended there shall be an audit; a post mortem does not secure the best results, and it does not secure the most desirable end. The thing to do is to have the two work in close harmony, put their heads together, and adopt a plan for getting their two sorts of information to the people.

The office that is suggested here, a director of cooperative agricultural extension work, would have as its main duty to confer with similar offices in the several States and to prepare rational plans and then set them in operation through the State machinery. Now, the question has been asked whether or not there are officers already in the department who can do this. Of course, there are officers in the department who are doing this, and there is substantially a director of extension work. This creates no new office, but the difficulty with the present office is that it is attached to one bureau. At present it is attached to the Bureau of Plant Industry, and naturally the impression arose that it was to demonstrate things in the Bureau of Plant Industry. But there are other things to demonstrate in the

Department of Agriculture than plant growing. You know that one of the most interesting and difficult problems we have before us is the question of the meat supply of the country, and obviously we need to demonstrate to the man on the farm how he can grow more live stock. There is just as much need for doing that as there is to demonstrate to him how he can grow more corn. We want to carry to him the best results of the researches made by the Bureau of Animal Industry. We may have something to say, incidentally, about roads; we may have something to say about the results in other bureaus, and, in my judgment, it will be vastly better for this work if we should have an officer, not to be attached to any particular bureau, but free to use the results of the investigations made by every bureau in the Department of Agriculture, and have none of this fear of cross-firing, or jealousy, or of the question of whether or not somebody else is the proper man to do it. You can not deal with the farm in its various phases, but you have to deal with it as a unit, and you want to demonstrate to the man on the farm everything that he is interested in. This is a matter of carrying information and not of investigation.

Mr. HAUGEN. Should it not come under the Director of Experiment Stations?

Secretary HOUSTON. Of course, the experiment stations are engaged primarily in investigations. They have large problems and there are a great many of them. They have many undertakings, and, even though you were to put this thing under the Director of Experiment Stations, this in itself is such a large undertaking that you would have to have somebody to look after it. You would have to have some man to look after this work, and, for the reasons I have suggested, I think he should be an officer not attached to any particular bureau, but that he should be an independent officer working in cooperation with the colleges and the bureaus to carry their information to the people—working, as I have said, in cooperation with the colleges. If you put it under the Director of Experiment Stations, you would not save expense, and, in my judgment, you would cripple its efficiency.

So far as concentration of power goes—I have heard that phrase rather frequently—we are now carrying on in a number of States demonstration work, through a machinery that is extensive, that reaches intimately into the homes of the individual farmers of the Nation. If you extend that to every State in the Union, obviously that would be a more complete and intimate centralization of power with reference to the individual citizen than the creation of an office that should cooperate with the State institutions that are intimately reaching the individual. This bill, in my judgment, is just the reverse of centralization of power, and one of the objects of it was to prevent what some gentlemen wisely, I think, desired to prevent; that is, the creation of a great central machinery that does so intimately reach the individual citizens when they could better be reached through State agencies acting in cooperation. It seems to me that the bill very desirably and completely meets that danger.

Mr. Chairman, these are the principal thoughts that occur to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, you have made the very interesting statement that the farm must be dealt with as a unit and not in its separate and distinct phases. The purpose of this bill is to carry all the information of every character that the department

and the colleges have out to the farmers, and that would include not only information that affects production, but information, also, that affects distribution.

Secretary HOUSTON. Certainly. Let me say, and you gentlemen will understand the spirit in which I state this—you know some of this work is very recent and is just finding itself—quite a number of State demonstration agents were here recently, and I met them. I raised with them the question as to what they were doing in the several sections in which they were working to induce the farmers to raise more live stock. I have been convinced for a long time that we are devoting too much attention—I will not say that, but too exclusive attention—to live stock on the big ranges as a big business, and that one great thing we ought to do is to induce the farmers in the settled sections of this country to grow more meat to eat and in greater variety. I was asking these gentlemen who are working in the more settled sections of the country—I mean in the older sections of the country—what they were doing to induce the farmer to grow more hogs, chickens, and things of that kind. Well, they said that they felt themselves rather hampered by the Bureau of Animal Industry, and they felt that the Bureau of Animal Industry was the one to do that work; but I said, "The Bureau of Animal Industry has no machinery by which to demonstrate to the farmers these things." The Bureau of Animal Industry is engaged, in so far as it has the funds, in investigations concerning live stock, but mainly in meat-inspection work and things of that kind. "Now," I said, "it seems to me that it is your duty to demonstrate to the farmers everything that they are interested in and to give them the benefit of all the information that the department has." That is what I had in mind when I said we must deal with the farm as a unit, and that is the difficulty I see from having this office associated with any particular bureau. Is there any other question, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions you desire to ask, gentlemen?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. One of these sections refers to projects that are to be laid out, and I do not know that I quite understand what is meant by "projects" in that connection. I understand that these men who go out now meet the farmers and give advice, or attempt to give it, on all lines of work in which the farmer is engaged.

Secretary HOUSTON. That is what we desire to have them do.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Now, the farmer might ask one of these agents a question relating to some phase of his work, and the agent might say, "That is not in line with the project laid down, and I can not tell you anything about that or give you any advice or assistance." I would like to know what is meant by "projects."

Secretary HOUSTON. In the first place, I should not think that any project would prevent the agent from answering a question. This demonstration work and this extension work or work of giving information, of course, might take a variety of directions in any State. You know, of course, that there are all sorts of proposals for getting matter more or less worth while to the farmers, and you have got to decide what lines of work are relatively most important at the time. You must know what you are going to try to execute in your community at any given time. One State, for instance, might limit itself

exclusively, unless there was some plan agreed upon, to home economics instead of demonstration with a view to meeting the boll-weevil problem. Suppose you take a concrete case. For instance, suppose you take Louisiana or Alabama, where the boll weevil is making itself felt; take Mississippi, where it is felt, and Georgia, where it will be felt—now, certainly the critical problem there is to prepare to meet the boll weevil, and you want specific plans made to prepare to meet the boll weevil.

A great many things are being done that are foolish; there are things suggested that experience would seem to indicate would be wise, and you would, therefore, lay out definite lines of work to meet that problem. You might decide that you are going to do that rather than give your exclusive time and attention to the extension of home economics. That is one illustration, and there are numbers of illustrations I might suggest to show that the plans would vary from State to State, because there are problems more urgent in some than in others. The State colleges would be the ones primarily to suggest these plans, because they are better acquainted with the conditions and with the people, and when they come with a plan for the work, our people would go over it with them and, of course, usually would indorse the plan and proceed with the work. But it seems to me very wise to have a definite thing or things in mind and outline them before you undertake operations. That is usual in any line of business. The number of directions which you might take, either in agricultural investigation or in carrying agricultural information to the farmers, is almost infinite, and that necessitates a more careful consideration of the direction in which you are going and what you are going to undertake. But, of course, having a definite plan or plans in mind would not shut off the agent or college or department from giving any incidental information. However, taking into consideration that appropriation of \$20,000 in a State in any one year, obviously you would want to use that amount to the best advantage, and you want to know definitely what you have in mind, what you are going to execute, and what directions you are going to give to your agencies. That is practically what I mean by "project." It is something that every man has in his mind more or less vaguely, and the thing to do is to get it in mind definitely. There is nothing new in that, and it is in line with university work generally. For instance, take the medical college; it will have 20 different divisions, and each division makes out its project and presents it to the board of regents for examination before the appropriation is made; and so, in this field, the same systematic course can be followed.

Mr. SLOAN. Would there be such flexibility in the projects laid out for the year, relating to certain work or demonstrations, that, if something should arise, such as an epidemic among live stock, the project could be shifted from the original purpose and the efforts of the demonstration agents directed to some more pressing condition?

Secretary HOUSTON. I think the bill would permit that beyond any question.

Mr. SLOAN. For instance, recently our people were interested very much in a number of things—in raising horses, for instance—now, could the project, after being laid down, be diverted so that the demonstration would cover other subjects? In other words, is there such flexibility in the bill as to make that possible?

Secretary HOUSTON. There is nothing in the bill of that sort. The bill says that plans must be made before the money is to be given to the State, but there is nothing in the bill that would prevent a feasible or practicable modification of the plan as agreed upon by the two departments. Of course, it might be that the plan would involve such a direction of the money that it would be difficult to divert it, but that would follow whether you had a plan agreed upon or not.

Mr. HEFLIN. Is it true that under this bill more farmers would be reached with this demonstration work, that more men will be engaged in the work, and that it will redound to the greater advantage of the farmer?

Secretary HOUSTON. I think so. There is this to be considered: There are some States not now doing any work of this kind; there are some States in which a great deal of this work is being done, and, I imagine, there are some States already appropriating more money for work akin to this than the Federal Government will be giving them; but, on the other hand, just as there are some States not now making appropriations for experimental work to meet the large appropriations that the Federal Government is making, so there are some that have made no provision for extension work. I know of one State the legislature of which recently made an appropriation for extension work and the governor cut it out. That State is therefore in the position of expending considerable sums of money for agricultural investigations with no provision for getting the results to the farmers. Now, this bill would probably act as a stimulus and such appropriations would probably be made and would probably remain. That seems to me to be a good thing. It will probably induce States, in which the agricultural colleges are giving most of their time to mechanics and have very little information to reach the farmers, to get in touch with the farmers. I think, therefore, that it will have not only the effect of causing the money to be used more wisely, but I think it will have the effect of stimulating some of our States to make provision for getting this information to the farmer.

Mr. HEFLIN. Will the men who are to do this work be selected in the same manner that they are now selected by you?

Secretary HOUSTON. I understand that primarily they will be State officers working in touch with the State offices and college offices of extension, just as the experiment-station workers in the various State colleges are primarily regarded as members of the college staff.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then you would have nothing to do with the selection of the men who are to be selected in the States?

Secretary HOUSTON. Practically so, but I do not anticipate, on the whole, that the selections would be less worthy than those we make at a distance.

Mr. HEFLIN. This bill would not disturb those men who are already in the field, would it? There is no danger from this bill that those men who are now doing good work in the field will be disturbed?

Secretary HOUSTON. I should think that the States would willingly attach these men to their offices of extension.

The CHAIRMAN. On account of their experience?

Secretary HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In section 2 of the old bill there is a proviso "That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to interfere

with either the demonstration of farm-management work as now conducted by the Department of Agriculture and known as the Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work and Farm Management Work." I have not examined the new bill as carefully as I should, but I do not see that proviso in section 2 or anywhere else, in so many words.

Secretary HOUSTON. That proviso, as I understand it, is not in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Is it the idea that this work will take the place of that, and that the appropriations made for that former work will be discontinued and that all of the work will be done under this appropriation?

Secretary HOUSTON. Yes; the theory being that we will get better results by doing it in cooperation with the colleges than by doing it directly through the Federal machinery.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. But it would not be advisable to discontinue the appropriation all at once for the work that is now going on, because this bill appropriates only \$10,000 for each State the first year.

Secretary HOUSTON. I think the present work should not be interfered with, but extended—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN (interposing). The present work should be extended?

Secretary HOUSTON. I mean that the sum total to-day of extension work; that is, of the work we are now doing, ought not to be crippled while the other is getting on its feet.

Mr. SLOAN. Would you continue both appropriations for the year?

Secretary HOUSTON. We should make such provision as may be necessary to keep up the work. That is a matter that must be worked out carefully in the estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The present organization would not be interfered with at all until this bill became operative.

Secretary HOUSTON. Later on, of course, when this bill gets into operation, this will cover the work we are now doing.

Dr. GALLOWAY. I might state for the information of the committee that we are expending for this work \$168,000 out of the appropriation for farm management. We have an additional appropriation of \$350,000 for farmers' cooperative demonstration work in the South. In addition to the \$168,000 we are expending the difference between \$325,000 for farm management and \$168,000, namely, \$157,000, in investigational work in farm management. That work will necessarily be continued, because it is for the accumulation of evidence and facts that will be used by the demonstration office, so that the Office of Farm Management would probably continue to exist as it is now, except that the demonstration office and work will be handled in one central office, combining all the demonstration work.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. You spoke of expending \$168,000 in this kind of work. The appropriation was \$375,000 for this fiscal year—

Dr. GALLOWAY (interposing.) There is an appropriation of \$350,000, but this \$168,000 is expended exclusively for this county demonstration work, and the rest of it is expended in investigations and farm-management work. Whenever questions arise involving farm economics, machinery, and many other problems that have never been made the subject of investigation, we must make the investiga-

tions before we are in a position to direct the farmer and advise him in the matter and in the management of his farm as a unit.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. After making investigations in which you use this money above the \$168,000, as you go along, will there be more of that appropriation available for cooperation in county work?

Dr. GALLOWAY. Yes; that will be the case naturally.

Secretary HOUSTON. May I emphasize the fact that I do not suppose anybody had it in mind that any work we are now doing in demonstrations would be discontinued or that the amount of it would be lessened under this arrangement. We shall have to make an adjustment of the appropriation and an adjustment ought to be made by which that work will go forward as fully as it is now going forward, and as this other work comes on, of course, the old work may be discontinued as a specific undertaking.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. When this bill was considered in the House, we found that there was an apprehension in the minds of some Members that the demonstration work was to be discontinued and the work provided for in this bill substituted for it, and in order to safeguard that and make it clear that that old work was not to be discontinued that proviso was put in. Now, would it not be advisable to incorporate in this bill we are now considering a safeguard of the same kind by providing that the old work shall be continued and finally merged into this work, with an increased appropriation?

Secretary HOUSTON. In the first place, I insist that this is a continuation of that work, and the only question, as I understand it, that you raise is whether there is danger of discontinuing that work before this machinery gets under way.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes, sir.

Secretary HOUSTON. That ought to be guarded against.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Would it be advisable to put a provision of that sort in this bill?

Secretary HOUSTON. I think that could be taken care of in the estimates.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That question will be raised when we consider this bill in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. This proviso was put in the bill on the floor of the House. The committee did not raise any objection to it, because they did not attach very much importance to the proposition. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to its going into the bill again.

Secretary HOUSTON. We will undertake in the estimates for the department to provide for that until this bill goes into full operation.

Mr. Moss. I would like to ask one general question. The proviso in the other bill would seem to indicate a perpetuation of the present method, whereas this bill ultimately means that the agricultural colleges shall assume leadership of the Federal Government or of the Department of Agriculture in this particular work, does it not?

Secretary HOUSTON. I should hardly put it as a matter of leadership—

Mr. Moss (interposing). I remember very particularly the debate on the floor of the House. You take, for instance, a State like Indiana; we are working on a plan developed under agricultural colleges, and I take it for granted that under the terms of this bill there will be in all States some degree of leadership recognized in the agri-

cultural colleges, but, until that time, I assume, of course, the present management will be maintained?

Secretary HOUSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSS. The practical question is whether the money appropriated for demonstration work is to continue. It would not be discontinued, would it?

Secretary HOUSTON. No, sir.

There is one other point the chairman raised which I overlooked at the time. Congress has placed upon the Department of Agriculture the exceedingly important task of beginning the study of crop distribution and marketing, and that is the most complex, difficult, and relatively, I think, the most important problem in agriculture to-day. Now, in that field, I think, we shall get a great deal of information that will be of service to the farmers, and that information will have to be taken to them just as carefully and completely as any other part of the information we secure.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Do we understand that this proposed line of work will include all the demonstration work now being done associated with hog cholera, Texas fever, cattle ticks, and other subjects?

Secretary HOUSTON. I can conceive that the Bureau of Animal Industry, through its own officers, may have to retain a very definite control of specific problems, but there will be no difficulty if a plan should be devised by the Department of Agriculture and the State colleges for giving information to the farmers and reaching them more intimately on specific problems like that. If the Bureau of Animal Industry has collected definite data that it desires to have the farmers know concerning hog cholera or anything else and it should be thought a wise plan to undertake to carry that information to the farmers through this machinery, it will be done, but it would not be necessary to give it the exclusive handling of that problem.

The CHAIRMAN. Your idea, I think, is my own in reference to this bill, and that is, that the local man on the ground is to be the machinery through which the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural colleges and experiment stations will make known to the farmers on the farms such information as they think will be valuable to them.

Secretary HOUSTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If the information happens to relate to the subject of hog cholera, that information will be made known through this agency, or if it happens to relate to the matter of cotton grading, or something of that kind, it will be made known in the same way. If the information happens to relate to the matter of marketing celery or onions, or something of that kind, these men will constitute the agency through which the Department of Agriculture and the colleges will get their best information to the men on the farms. Is that a correct statement of it?

Secretary HOUSTON. Yes; and this will not interfere in the slightest degree with those special agencies that are tackling special problems. Of course, unless they have information that is worth while to give these other agencies can not use it.

Mr. HEFLIN. In section 1 there is a proviso—

That in any State in which two or more such colleges have been or hereafter may be established the appropriations hereinafter made to such State shall be administered by such college or colleges as the legislature of such State may direct.

Secretary HOUSTON. That is the usual provision.

Mr. HEFLIN. Could not the legislature of that State direct that this work should be done through the secretary of agriculture of that State in connection with the colleges?

Secretary HOUSTON. Under this bill, of course—

Mr. HEFLIN (interposing). Do you think it wise to amend the bill so that the secretaries of agriculture in the various States could be in direct touch with you, so they could cooperate with you?

Secretary HOUSTON. Personally, I think not. Of course, that is one element that you are going to hear from. It has been the policy of the Federal Government up to this time to work through the State land-grant colleges. They were created originally for that specific purpose, and everything, so far as I am aware, that the Federal Government has undertaken to do for agriculture in the States has been done through this agency, originally created for that purpose. They are the only agencies at present existing in most of the States that have the support or machinery, with the right bias of mind and attitude, to undertake this work efficiently. Very many of the State departments of agriculture are not especially well supported. Their officers are not always men of skill, and they are frequently without a continuous policy.

Now, the State colleges ordinarily have a higher degree of stability; they have many scientists; they are doing this work in a variety of directions, and it seems to me, for these reasons as well as for the reason that the policy of the Federal Government has been to work through them, that that plan ought to be continued. I am aware of the fact that there are commissioners of agriculture in several States who would like to see this bill so drawn as to make the cooperation exclusively with them or optional with the State, but I believe, for the reasons I have indicated, that it would be a mistake. For instance, I do not happen to know anything about what machinery the State of Wisconsin has, outside of its university where the land-grant college is located, for dealing with agricultural problems, so that, as you will understand of course, I can mention it without any criticism, because I do not know anything about it. But I do know that the University of Wisconsin has one of the most satisfactory and scientific agricultural establishments in the world for discovering agricultural information and giving it to the farmer. Now, it seems to me that it would be a waste for you to go outside of that institution for cooperative effort and set up another agency that has not the facilities of the university. I think these remarks will apply to probably every State in the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions, gentlemen?

Mr. HAUGEN. I understood Dr. Galloway to say that the department had under consideration a plan that would bring about greater cooperation in the department.

Secretary HOUSTON. It has.

Mr. HAUGEN. I want to call your attention to the defect in the system. For instance, the Weather Bureau has an appropriation for a building, say, in San Francisco.

Secretary HOUSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAUGEN. And it sends its agent out there. The Forest Service has another appropriation for a building in the same town, and it sends its agent out there. You have two men traveling in the

same direction, in the same territory, and doing the same character of work. In other words, you have the expense of two men traveling and the services of two men in doing what one man could do at just one-half the expense.

Secretary HOUSTON. I think the instance you give would be a very good one. A gentleman who is sent out to locate and plan a building for forestry purposes in Montana—

Mr. HAUGEN (interposing). For office purposes in the city of San Francisco, for instance.

Dr. GALLOWAY. There would not be a building in any city.

Mr. HAUGEN. Offices.

Dr. GALLOWAY. They rent them.

Secretary HOUSTON. I had in mind a proposal to erect a building for the Weather Bureau; that is, for Weather Bureau purposes. Those purposes are essentially different from those for which any forestry building would be erected. I would as soon send a preacher to handle a law case as to send a forestry man to plan or erect or secure a location for a Weather Bureau building. It so happens that a Weather Bureau building is a very difficult thing to locate. There have to be specific conditions surrounding it that a forestry man may not be a good man to judge of. The truth of the matter is that the most of these things are very specialized, and it does not follow that a man in one department can easily execute them for another department.

So far, however, as any duplication of work anywhere in the department is concerned, I would be glad to discover it and to put an end to it. As Dr. Galloway has said, I think there is some lost motion in the Department of Agriculture along the line I suggested when I was discussing the relation of this office to animal husbandry and plant industry, and we are now considering a plan which will eliminate all that lost motion. If there is anything further that we can do in devising a plan, which we hope to be able to submit to the committee, of course we shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think that is very important, and I am glad to know it.

Secretary HOUSTON. We have in one office discovered about 25 people who were unnecessary.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am glad to know that.

Secretary HOUSTON. And we have taken steps to eliminate them. We have discovered in another important bureau quite a considerable number of activities that were really undesirable, and we have undertaken to eliminate them, and I hope, as we go forward, that we shall be able to eliminate everything that is undesirable.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are matters which will be brought before the committee when the regular bill is under consideration?

Secretary HOUSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEFLIN. It strikes me that the secretaries of agriculture in the various States should in some way be associated with this work, either as members of an advisory board or in some way; that could be done by an act of the legislature.

Secretary HOUSTON. That should be done by the States.

Mr. HEFLIN. There is nothing in this bill which would prevent that?

Secretary HOUSTON. No, sir. There are several very unfortunate situations in our States. One is that the different State institutions are fighting one another and are jealous of one another, thinking more of institutional advancement than the people.

Mr. YOUNG. That is very largely true in Texas.

Secretary HOUSTON. Yes; and in other States. The same thing happens in the State departments of agriculture, and each one wants to convince the people that he is doing the job. If any way could be discovered by which the agricultural machinery of the States could be coordinated, as we are trying to coordinate ours with theirs, then you would work a revolution, but that is a State job.

Mr. SLOAN. I note that a large amount of this appropriation will be used in paying the salaries of demonstrators, probably. Do I understand that in the matter of the salaries of these demonstrators and in directing them the General Government retains the same amount of authority coordinate and coequal with the State, or is that surrendered to the State?

Secretary HOUSTON. Practically to the State.

Mr. SLOAN. The reason I asked that question is this: By surrendering to the State the appointees will be probably almost exclusively from the State, and is it not true that some of the most valuable demonstrators are men who are taken from another State, with a different point of view, that they may in the new situation bring that which is best from the State, and if the Government retains at least a part of the say in who should be the demonstrators would you not get generally a better result? For instance, we think a great deal of the people of our State and that our demonstrators would be efficient, but I have no doubt that by bringing a man from Texas, Wisconsin, or another State where there had been special conditions, or where the industry had been developed to a higher degree than in our State, better results would be obtained.

Secretary HOUSTON. I think there are two things which must be borne in mind. Of course, you realize that this is exactly the same situation with respect to the other Federal appropriation for experiment station work where, in some States, the colleges select those officials. So it is in the college work for which the Federal Government makes an appropriation. On the whole, considering the material available in this country and the salaries that they pay, I suppose that the colleges make about as wise selections as could be made.

As to your second point of getting a man who has had experience elsewhere. I think these gentlemen will bear me out as to the difficulty we encounter in getting men, and the work of many other institutions is undoubtedly hampered by constantly seeking men and having to get them from the outside. I do not think that the colleges are suffering from a lack of new blood or from a lack of men who have had experience elsewhere. Whether or not it would be desirable to incorporate a provision of that kind, I am not prepared at this time to say, but let us try to get into our minds that we are suggesting nothing new when we are depending upon the States to select the local machinery. By the advance made in this bill we are coordinating the machinery, and the Federal Government will have a fuller opportunity to consult with the States about the plans and machinery than heretofore.

It would be inconceivable to me, if President Thompson were discussing these plans, that he should not want all the information we have about men who can do this work, and it is inconceivable to me that I should not feel free to suggest to President Thompson any man that I happen to know; and I think that we shall be brought into a position of consulting about these matters instead of one of apparent hostility. There has been some little friction, but I think it has grown mainly out of the fact that there has been no definite putting of heads together all along the line.

Mr. HEFLIN. If we could get the secretaries of agriculture in the States interested in it and on the board in some official way, it would work out to great advantage.

Mr. REILLY. There is no secretary of agriculture in some States.

Mr. HEFLIN. They call them commissioners.

Mr. REILLY. In our State it is entirely under the board of regents of the university and the dean of the university.

Mr. HEFLIN. Do they not call them commissioners?

Mr. REILLY. No, sir; most of our Western States have agricultural colleges.

Secretary HOUSTON. That is a matter for the State legislature.

Mr. REILLY. In Wisconsin every year they have one week for the farmers of the State, and they gather at the capital in thousands, where for one week they go through the different lines of progressive farming, as they call it. Then, they have a series of farm institutes, where they send out specialists to instruct in methods of soil culture, animal culture, and methods concerning the best ways that have been discovered at the Wisconsin experiment station. Then, they issue an extensive line of bulletins, as the Agricultural Department does here. Those are distributed all over the State.

Secretary HOUSTON. If I may be permitted a suggestion, I would limit the State boards of agriculture to administrative work and give the educational work to the colleges. I think the trouble is that in many of the States the State departments of agriculture are not equipped to do educational work. They are trying to do it and are conflicting with the colleges and competing with the colleges. I should make the commissioners or agriculture administrative, and I should give the educational work to the colleges. I shall be glad to answer any questions.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Secretary. I will now ask Mr. Holder to make a brief statement.

STATEMENT OF MR. ARTHUR E. HOLDER.

Mr. HOLDER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I represent the American Federation of Labor, as its legislative committee, and I feel that it is only proper that I should be here to-day to make an expression concerning the attitude of the members of our organization toward this subject.

I think it is generally known that for several Congresses we have favored the older plan or the former plan of connecting this subject with the industrial-trade training that was incorporated in the old Dolliver-Davis bill and afterwards in the Page-Wilson bill, which has been argued before this committee twice and before the Senate Committee on Agriculture several times. However, I am commissioned

to say for the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, which is now in session, that it realizes the importance of the general principles contained in this feature of the Lever bill, which was a part of the former bill advocated and urged by our organization. If we can not get all we want in one bill, we are perfectly willing to assist and cooperate with the committee wherever we can and with the agencies, educational and administrative, to do something in behalf of the general principles contained in the Lever bill. I think, Mr. Chairman, that is all it is necessary for me to say at this time, and I thank the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Holder, and I assure you that the committee appreciates your coming.

We shall now be pleased to hear from President Thompson, of the University of Ohio.

STATEMENT OF DR. W. O. THOMPSON.

Dr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have appeared before you so often that I shall be very brief. I regret that the gentleman who has just finished making his statement has left the room, because I should have liked to say to him that the association of agricultural colleges in the States certainly favor the bill and the principle of vocational training. There is no antagonism to that principle in this bill, and that is one consideration of the bill, it having other features.

This bill has been so illuminatingly discussed this morning that I have the necessity of saying very little. This extension work is essentially teaching work. We have been teaching by one method and another in our industries. We are teaching largely by the laboratory method—that is, by demonstrating to the pupil or the student the thing that we are trying to teach. For 50 years we have been going on in these colleges teaching by demonstration in our laboratories and by other methods. Now we are proposing to go out to the people with the school and teach by such methods as are practicable, chiefly the demonstration method. Pardon an intimate reference, but we are discussing the question of projects, and this year one of our men in Ohio, after consulting with the president and the superintendent of the agricultural stations, proposed to spend his vacation, or about 60 days of it, on the farms of Ohio.

Accordingly, we got up a schedule, and we sent around, over northwestern Ohio chiefly, the information that this gentleman would appear in certain communities at certain times, according to the schedule, while the crops were just harvested and some were still growing, and discuss the condition of the crops in that part of Ohio. The result was that from 30 to 50 farmers gathered together in a community and went out over the farms within an area, examined the soil on the farms, investigated the condition of the growing crops, and would come back to the barn or possibly under the shade of some tree and spend two or three or four hours in discussing the condition of the crop, why the condition was such as it was, etc. The reports are now to the effect that this has brought to those farmers more information of a desirable sort than any farmers' institute, because they were able to discuss the growing crops right on the ground. We paid for that out of the extension funds of the State of Ohio. We never

had such a thing before. Probably we shall do something similar again. That is a distinct project; we have never attempted it before. That is teaching by a new method; that is all. It is teaching differently from the institute or in the classroom or anywhere else, but it is done by our professor, who himself had a most delightful experience and who came in brown as a berry and in fine shape for the fall work, having seen perhaps 2,000 different farmers in the 60 days. That result we regard as legitimate extension work and as essentially teaching work, and the essential feature of this is cooperation between the Secretary of Agriculture and the States.

There is only one thing that I have in mind, and that is the tentative agreement entered into by the colleges with the department last spring, which has been cordially received in every part of the Union and will be a matter of discussion and consideration at the meeting here in Washington next November, and that is with reference to the investment that the Federal Government has been making for 50 years in these agricultural colleges. It looks to us as if we should get closer together, with a better organization, a more efficient expenditure of money, and a better understanding than ever before. These colleges and stations are the places where the Federal Government has been pouring in money—for 50 years in the colleges and 25 years in the stations. One feature of this bill is that \$10,000 a year shall be apportioned to a State, but if the State does not react it can not have any additional expenditure. That reaction is the most essential thing we need in agricultural college life to day. There are just three things which we do. We start with the proposition to discover agricultural knowledge or science and undertake to teach it to the limited number who are available in the agricultural schools and colleges.

Now, we are going to the farmers' institutes and other agencies, but our practical difficulty is to get the reaction of the individual farmer, the thing that ought to be done. The director of stations in Ohio has stated that within five years the agricultural produce of Ohio could be doubled if the farmers of the State would do what the experiment station says and has demonstrated can be done. Now, the practical problem is to get to every farmer and have him understand that that thing can be done and get him to react. The Federal Government is trying to get reaction from the States by saying, "We will give you \$1,000 if you will give \$1,000; we will go half way with you on this project, and if you will furnish the other half we will furnish the first half."

The Federal control of its own money is an essential problem and a very practical situation. If any criticism could be made of Federal expenditures for 50 years in the colleges and stations, I should say that it could be directed against the lack of careful supervision of the expenditure of its money. It has been called a post mortem or audit, and the Nelson amendment of 1907 proceeded to say that this money should be used in a certain way, and the second Morrill Act proceeded to say that the money should be expended in a certain way. Those acts grews out of the fact that there was a feeling of the careless expenditure of money.

Now comes along the extension field, which admittedly is the largest area, and therefore the least subject to supervision, in which it is proposed that before the money is expended the Department of Agricul-

ture, representing the Federal Government, and these colleges, representing the State governments, shall get together in a friendly council and lay out the projects, and provide, as far as human agencies can provide, for the wise, economical, and efficient expenditure of this money. Gentlemen, it seems to me that that feature of the bill is the wisest feature of the whole matter and ought to commend itself to State and Federal agencies alike. And so, speaking for the Association of Agricultural Colleges, I should say without hesitation that that is a very desirable and wise feature. Now, my friend Mr. Haugen has said something about State rights. The curious thing is that the advocate of State rights is now in the North, whereas he used to be in the South, and that is exactly the thing I think this bill provides for. For example, why should we in the State of Ohio object to the Federal Government expending its own money in a way it can approve? I do not see that we as a State should make an objection to that. Now, this bill does not anticipate that the States shall not have the liberty to determine what shall be done in any line in which the States may be interested.

Mr. HAUGEN. The bill provides—

That no payment out of the additional appropriations herein provided shall be made in any year to any State until an equal sum has been appropriated for that year by the legislature of such State.

Dr. THOMPSON. Yes; but the bill does not provide for all of the things that may be done by the States. In that connection I want to make some reference to the matter of hog cholera. In the State of Ohio we are making a test in Fayette County. After due deliberation a special appropriation has been made for Fayette County in order to test whether hog cholera can be eliminated from that county or not. That county was agreed upon because it represented a variety of conditions in Ohio and it was thought that if we could eliminate hog cholera from Fayette County we might free the whole State. We centralized that problem in one county. We have our hog serum farm in Franklin County, but we are making the test in Fayette County, and that does not interfere with what we have been doing in agricultural extension work all over the State, but it localized that one specific problem in Fayette County and the whole State of Ohio will be interested in the next few years—because hog cholera can not be eliminated in 30 days and perhaps not in 30 months—in seeing what is done in that county with that problem. Now, I understand that this proposition does in no way interfere with a State's right to go ahead and do anything it wants to do in addition to anything which might be considered a large problem and of great importance to the State.

The States may have some local needs that do not apply generally to all of the States, and, for example, I will refer to the State of Ohio. We reach from the Lakes to the Ohio River. Up on the Lakes we have peaches, grapes, and a good deal of fruit, where we are protected by the Lakes; in the central portion of Ohio frost is a very unwelcome visitor at very inopportune times, and along the river the farms are protected by the hills. Necessarily there are certain problems to be considered for each division, and, as I say, in the State of Ohio there are three distinct problems to be considered. You will find that the same thing is true in Michigan and in other

States of the Union. Now, the study of those problems through the colleges and stations and the development of this work through a series of years in cooperation with the Federal Government seems to me to open up the largest possibility of usefulness of any field of endeavor into which we have gone in this general way.

Now, something was said a little while ago about good men, to which the Secretary of Agriculture made a very adequate reply, but he will pardon me, I know, for giving a little experience supplementing his reply. In this extension work we have a staff varying from 15 to 20 on full time and then people that we employ for portions of the year as seems to be wise. We have made contributions from our workers to West Virginia, to Kansas, to Wisconsin, to Iowa, and Indiana, and these are, in a sense, like taxes, enforced contributions.. We did not want to send them, but we had to do so because they came up with the money and we felt we could not very well resist. Now, we have drawn our workers from other States simply because it was desirable to do so. I believe that the outworking of that plan through the years and through the different associations, especially the Association of Agricultural Colleges, will lead us to a distribution of men and of women who will increase the efficiency of this work.

I have spoken before this committee as to the merits of agricultural extension two or three times; I have been before Congress now for half a dozen years until my voice has got to be "as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal," and I do not want to speak too much. I only desire this morning to say that I believe the Association of Agricultural Colleges will, when it meets in November, cordially and warmly indorse this bill for passage. I have had some correspondence with members of the executive committee and regret that they are not able to be here. However, I know the sentiment of the committee, and I believe I speak for the association when I say most heartily we shall be glad to see this bill reported. That does not mean that these little details of expression might not be amended. For example, Dean Russell is not quite sure that this provision that the governor shall approve in the absence of the legislature is quite as clear as it might be; I am not sure it is or is not, but that is a matter of unimportant detail. I do not care to speak about those little features, but I do say that the essence of the bill, the distinguishing and characteristic features of this bill are such as ought to be cordially approved, in my judgment, and unless there are questions to be asked, I will thank the committee for its kind attention.

Secretary HOUSTON. I would like to ask Dr. Thompson what he would have to say on this: I have heard a good many criticisms of this kind, that if you get money from the Federal Treasury for various enterprises there is no stopping place, and that they will bankrupt us. Is it not true that this bill as drawn provides an automatic check on that, first, that it places a limit in the bill, and, second, that it requires the States to contribute, and is not that an adequate safeguard in that respect?

Dr. THOMPSON. About that question there are two things to be said. There is no limit to the amount of work that may be done so far as we now know it. Any man who wants to engage in helpful philanthropic or educational work will find there is practically no limit, but so far as aid from the Federal Government is concerned there is a practical limit, and this bill, I think, provides that the

Federal Government's work shall be limited. Now, there are three distinct things that we are proposing for the Federal Government to do. One is agricultural teaching, and we have apparently reached the limit on that; another is the experiment station, and we have reached a practical limit on that through the Hatch and Adams Acts; and the third is this extension work, for which this bill provides a limit. Of course if 10, 15, or 20 years from now the United States feels that these colleges should be further endowed, these experiment stations further endowed, or that this extension work should be added to, that could easily be done, because there would be no law against it; that would be within the discretion of Congress.

These three things now present their natural limitations, and these limitations represent, so far as we can see, the judgment of the cooperating agencies of the States and Federal Government; but there is no doubt about these things being indefinitely extended if it should be thought wise, because Congress always has that power and the States always have that power. I do not believe that Congress would wish to limit the cooperation of the States with the Federal Government, and in this particular work that is vital and fundamental. If in that cooperation we shall demonstrate that the work should be extended, sufficient funds will be given for that purpose; and if it should be demonstrated in the experience of the years that we ought to double our energies, of course that is a matter for the future to take care of; but it will not present itself in the life of the present generation, in my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions to be asked, we are very much obliged to you, Dr. Thompson. Have you any witnesses you desire to present to the committee?

Dr. THOMPSON. No, sir; the president of the association is here, but he says he can not speak of this because he is not prepared. I told him I was not prepared, but that I had to speak, and he says he does not have to.

The CHAIRMAN. We would be very glad to hear from him.

**STATEMENT OF MR. E. H. JENKINS, OF NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
DIRECTOR OF THE CONNECTICUT EXPERIMENT STATION.**

Mr. JENKINS. I think I have nothing to add to what has already been said by the representative of the association. However, I will refer to one question which was raised, namely, as to the direction exercised by the Department of Agriculture in this extension work. A great deal, of course, will depend on the judgment and sense of the man who is appointed director, but if the relations shall be as pleasant with him as they have been with the Office of Experiment Stations, which especially has the direction of the station work under the Adams fund, certainly it will leave nothing to be desired. The Office of Experiment Stations requires from each agricultural station every year, in advance of the work done, a statement of the projects which they will undertake, and I can testify that that has added greatly to the efficiency and value of the station work, and I think that this direction of the extension work by the Department of Agriculture will work equally well. I do not think that I have anything more to say.

The CHAIRMAN. I wish to ask the consent of the committee to publish as a part of these hearings an article by Mr. Forrest Crissey in the Saturday Evening Post a few weeks ago, which, while not entirely in line with this proposition, is at the same time, I think, illuminating, and if the committee has no objection I will make it a part of the hearings.

(Said article follows:)

TRAMP TEACHERS.

[By Forrest Crissey.]

HOW THE KAISER TRAINS HIS FUTURE FARMERS.

The county demonstrator is fast becoming a big figure in American farming. Under the activities of the Office of Farm Demonstration, operated by the United States Department of Agriculture, the itinerant teacher of better farming methods has for years followed the highways of the South and wrought a peaceful revolution in the crop systems of the cotton country. In the North, however, the wandering farm teacher is still something of a novelty, and there remain plenty of tillers of the soil who regard him as a new-fangled intruder of doubtful antecedents.

By the old-school farmers he is generously suspected of being a good man at making a fat job for himself—a job compounded of equal parts of college theory and the gift of gab. But the burden of the indictment against the traveling instructor is that he is a novelty and lacks the background of solid and established tradition. In spite of his large profession of democracy, no man in America has a more tenacious respect for tradition than the farmer who is still tilling the land according to the rules by which his grandfather raised crops.

This attitude of the older farmers toward the traveling teacher of agriculture is not a trivial matter in its relation to the immediate future of better farming in America, for the farmers of this class still hold the title deeds to most of the farm lands under cultivation. This fact should never be forgotten by the man who hopes to "do something for the American farmer."

It is well, then, to ask: Has the county demonstrator, the traveling teacher of agriculture, anything behind him in the shape of solid tradition and convincing precedent that the man who clings to old traditions and the established order of things is bound to respect? Have they tried this thing out in any country of the Old World where all things are done thoroughly and where it is a virtue to make haste slowly? Is the traveling teacher of farm methods the rank innovation that he seems, or is he, perchance, an Americanized adaptation of an Old-World institution that has been developed in the practical way that the older nations have of testing methods before giving them the seal of approval?

The traveling teacher of farming is an Old-World institution. Along with many of the most serviceable things used in this country he should bear the trade-mark, "Made in Germany." He is the product of one of the oldest and most conservative countries of Europe—and one of the most scientific and efficient, too.

Not long ago Mr. Edwin G. Cooley returned from two years of investigation in Germany, where he was sent as the educational industrial commissioner of the Commercial Club of Chicago.

"The farm demonstrator," declares Mr. Cooley, "is so new in America that he is good for a first-page story in almost any metropolitan newspaper having a country circulation. In the Empire of the Kaiser he is an old story—a tried and tested cog in the great educational machine of a country that leads the world in educational methods."

WHAT GERMAN FARM BOYS STUDY.

"Here a large proportion of our farmers—those who cling to the ancient traditions and the time-honored methods—look upon the county demonstrator as an intruder, an educational interloper, a half-baked and rather expensive experiment. Over there the traveling teacher is an established part of the rural landscape, as firmly rooted and familiar as a field of red cabbages. If you hit the country roads at the right season of the year in Prussia you are as certain to encounter one of these tramping teachers of farming as you are to meet the omnipresent military officer in the town. The Wanderlehrer is no experiment there. His status is settled and his value in the great educational scheme of the Empire is fixed and permanent. He is there because the far-

sighted men who worked out that remarkable and marvelously complete educational plan saw that he was needed to discharge an educational function that no other kind of teacher could discharge.

"When the great thinkers of Germany recognized, a few years ago, that their natural material resources were limited and that the greatest resource of the Empire lay in the potential skill of its workers, and that this resource must be developed to the highest possible point if Germany was to hold her own in the great competitive struggle of nations, the farming industry came in for just as searching an analysis as any other industry then operating in the Kaiser's domain.

"The lowest unit in the educational system for the German farmer, as it was at first planned, was the winter village school. Later the great minds that were planning this comprehensive scheme of vocational training came up against the fact that fully 70 per cent of the children of Prussian farmers were practically debarred from attending any of the higher agricultural schools and that they could attend the agricultural school in the village only during the winter months, because their labor was essential to the farm from the time the ground was prepared for planting until the harvest was finished. It was then that the creators of the German educational system added another unit to their plan—that of the *Wanderlehrer*.

"Of all the teachers on earth the *Wanderlehrer* is undoubtedly tightest to his job. In the winter months, in the village school, he lays the foundation of his farm instruction so far as its theory is concerned. But the moment the cropping season starts this school is dissolved, the children go to the fields, and the *Wanderlehrer* 'hits the pike' with a few personal belongings in a bundle on his shoulder. Before following the tramp teacher on his rounds from farm to farm it is well to know the ground that he has been covering with his pupils in the winter season. Here is the course of study followed in almost 300 winter agricultural schools in Germany:

"1. Cultivation of the ground, general field and plant culture, theory of fertilization for special plants.

"2. Teaching of the breeding, feeding, and handling of domestic animals.

"3. Zoology and veterinary science.

"4. General business instruction.

"5. Agricultural chemistry.

"6. Physics.

"7. Plant culture.

"8. Introduction to the forms of business correspondence.

"9. Theory of the principles of farm management.

"10. Agricultural bookkeeping.

"11. German language.

"12. Arithmetic.

"13. Geometry, surveying, and drawing.

"14. Fire brigades.

"All of the teachers and a large percentage of the assistants are graduates of the higher educational institutions. Each is really an expert in his agricultural specialty. The farm boy who spends the winter under the kind of drilling to which he is subjected in one of these schools carries back to the farm with him in the spring a grounding in the fundamental theory of agriculture that would undoubtedly do credit to a student in any agricultural high school in America.

"Going to school in Germany is not an indoor pastime or a side line to the business of athletic sports. In these winter schools the work is alive with a fine earnestness, a splendid enthusiasm on the part of both pupil and teacher, and to spend a day in one of these schools is an inspiration to an American teacher. Doing so can not fail to give him an understanding of the wonderful equipment that the German farmer of the new generation will carry to his work as a food producer.

"Kaiser Wilhelm is said to have made the boast that the time is soon to come when, if Germany were isolated from the whole world by an impenetrable trade wall, she would be able to meet all the needs of all her people. To come into touch with the spirit of these winter schools and then to follow the *Wanderlehrer* on his pilgrimage from farm to farm through the whole growing season, is to be forced to the conclusion that the Kaiser's declaration is certainly no idle boast. While the equipment of most of these winter schools can not be described as elaborate, it is certainly ample, especially when the fact is taken into consideration that the real demonstration work is to be done in the fields of the farm homes from which the pupils come."

OBJECT LESSONS IN THE FIELD.

"The big event on the little German farm is the periodical visit of the *Wanderlehrer*. This tramp teacher is treated with the greatest respect and given every honor that the peasant farmer can bestow. From sunrise until sunset the *Wanderlehrer* is in the field

with the boy of the farm home, focusing into actual practice on the soil the theories that have been discussed during the winter in the schoolroom. Incidentally, of course, the father and older brothers crowd about the tramp teacher and absorb the instruction that he is giving to the boy who has been his winter pupil. But for at least once in his life the small boy is the center of the family; and the Wanderlehrer never loses sight of the fact that his attentions must be centered upon his pupil.

"Every crop and every animal on the farm passes under the inspection of the Wanderlehrer, and in the evening the observations of the day are reviewed and again discussed, and each member of the household is given opportunity to ply the traveling instructor with questions."

But the German farm boy has no monopoly of the benefits of the itinerant teacher who brings education to home and field, where its practical value is bound to be tested in real results; the Prussian farm girl is also visited by a Wanderlehrerin in petticoats. According to Mr. Cooley, the skirted traveling teacher of the future housewives of the farm home is fully as important a factor in the scheme of carrying practical education to the home of the farm peasant as is the Wanderlehrer in trousers—and perhaps a bit more important. Because the German father is almost invariably a good feeder, and life without its pleasures would from his point of view be a failure, he welcomes this colporteur of the gospel of efficient kitchens and sanctions any teaching of hers that promises to improve his table.

Then, too, thrift is the first commandment among the farmers in the Kaiser's country, and the Wanderlehrerin never fails to make a "home run" in holding out to the housewife the promise that the education she is dispensing will yield the fruits of practical economy, give better results at lower cost, and "save a pfennig here and there." So long as the Wanderlehrerin in skirts is under the roof of the farm home she is in practical command of the kitchen and of all the home activities that fall to the lot of the average German housewife.

Her teaching is intensely practical. She is as tight to her job as is her brother educator who follows his boy pupils from field to field. All her instruction in the art of cooking is keyed to the demands and conditions of country living. She lays strong emphasis upon the salting, curing, smoking, and cooking of meats of every sort, the handling of milk and the making of cheese and butter. The preserving of vegetables and fruits is another cardinal point in her curriculum. The care of poultry, of pigs, and of calves is a standard part of the German housewife's duties, and the Wanderlehrerin is an adept in these arts, giving her instruction by example in the feed pens.

Another subject never neglected by this wandering woman missionary of better farm living is the matter of hygiene and sanitation in the farm home. Each fraulein is given simple, practical lessons in the care of the sick, and any unsanitary condition in the home is promptly pointed out to the family. As the woman of the German farm is the official gardener, the subject of garden management is always covered by the visiting teacher. Laundry work and needlework of every sort are carefully taught by these itinerant teachers, with the result that the average girl in the German farm home is a sounder and shrewder judge of fabrics and their value than are most American women who have generous charge accounts at the big metropolitan stores.

This outline of the work done by the German Wanderlehrer is too scant to give an adequate idea of its full scope, but it will suggest something of its thoroughness and practicality. It is real farm education reduced to its simplest terms, stripped of every frill and carried to the kitchen and the field, where the boy and the girl will work for years to come—in most cases for the remainder of their natural lives. It is a training that meets conditions as they are and in their own terms, not an effort to force upon the pupil the education that he ought to have if he were to become chancellor of the empire instead of a peasant farmer.

But how does all this hook up with the boy and the girl of the American farm? It doesn't—not at present anyhow. And this is right where the trouble comes in. However, there is a growing conviction among American educators that the time has come for us to learn something about lower education from the Kaiser and his countrymen—especially about the education of the farmers' children. And some keen, progressive school-teachers are feeling their way to practical results in this new field.

MR. HOLDEN'S STUDY OF CORN.

Few educators in America are closer to farm conditions and to the future farmers that are now carrying their lunch pails to the district schools of this country than is Prof. P. G. Holden, formerly of the University of Iowa, at Ames. He was country-born and has kept close to the farm and the "little red schoolhouse" throughout the whole of his career. He worked his way through the Michigan Agricultural College by teaching in a district school for nine terms. Later he was elected county super-

intendent of schools for his home county, and in all of the more important positions he has since filled he has never lost his intimate touch with the farm home and the children of that home. If any American educator who has achieved the title of professor is entitled to be considered the spokesman of the country school, that man is undoubtedly Prof. Holden. What does he think of the German Wanderlehrer system and of its possibilities as an object lesson to America?

"Real education," declares Prof. Holden, "is teaching the boy in the terms of his own life. You never really reach him until you do this. There is something in the home environment of every boy that holds the possibility of awakening his sleeping faculties to action—not one thing generally, but many. And these things are almost invariably connected with practical work of some sort, usually with the activities of the life going on about him outside of the school. Boys and girls are interested in doing things, not in the abstract speculations with which the textbooks are so largely filled."

"Long before I knew of the wonderful Wanderlehrer system, by which Germany is developing the boys and girls of her small farms, I saw the force of the principle on which that system is founded. In fact, my convictions on this subject forced me into becoming an amateur Wanderlehrer myself."

"I was then teaching a little district school in Michigan and was about as unsuccessful as the average country school-teacher. A few of my pupils seemed to show an almost human interest in their studies, but with most of them study was merely a matter of going through the motions. When it finally dawned upon me that perhaps this deadly indifference was quite as much the fault of the system, the textbooks, and the teacher as the fault of the pupils, I determined to see if I couldn't find out what the boys were really interested in and so meet them on their own ground."

"'Boys,' I said to them, 'about the biggest thing in this country round here is corn. When anything threatens the corn crop you can read it in your father's face. And when a big crop of corn is harvested you begin to count on a fat Christmas and other good things at home. Now, it seems to me that we ought to look into anything as important to all our homes as corn and see what we can learn about it. Perhaps we could find something that might help your fathers to get a larger and surer crop. And because common sense teaches us that to get a good crop we must have good seed, let's have a little seed show of our own, right here in school. I'd like to have every boy ask his father to pick out the best ear of corn grown in his field. Then we'll get them all together and talk it over.'

"The instant this proposal was made I saw a new light appear in the face of Dick, the dullest boy in school. He seemed to awaken suddenly. Book lessons were remote and unreal to him, but corn was tangible and interesting. Every boy brought an ear of corn, selected as being the best that the home farm had produced. It was the liveliest day that schoolhouse had ever seen. The dull boy was fairly tingling with interest. I judged those ears as carefully as I ever judged any corn later in life at any national corn show. The grading of each ear was explained in detail and discussed until every boy agreed that the decision was fair. To my great regret the awakened Dick had brought the poorest ear of all, and was more abashed over this failure than he had ever been when he flunked in reading, writing, or arithmetic.

"For 17 years that school had not been visited by a parent or patron excepting on state occasions. But the next morning I had two callers. The first was Dick's father. He bolted in without knocking.

"'Say,' he exclaimed by way of introduction, 'Dick says my ear's the poorest of any. I don't believe it.'

"We laid out all the corn on my desk and I asked Dick to pick out his ear. He did so in a sheepish, shamefaced way.

"'Well,' commented the father, 'it was kind of dark when I picked it out. I know I've got better corn in the crib than that.'

"Then we had a corn talk in which Dick spoke more words than had passed his lips in the classroom before. He had found himself—and, what is more, I had found him and his father, too."

THE EDUCATION THAT COUNTS.

"From that moment I had the key to the situation. We improvised a very simple corn tester, and the results of the test were awaited with keener interest by every one in the school than had been any examination ever held in that schoolhouse. When the germinating period was finished, the boys were given a taste of a new kind of arithmetic—in fact they didn't know that it was arithmetic. First we made a test to compute the percentage of germination, and then figured the loss from poor germination as compared with the tests of the best seed corn in the State. Then we extended this line of figuring to the entire corn crop of the township. The boys were open-

mouthing at the results, and every one of them went home and demonstrated to his father how much he was losing on his corn crop every year by the planting of inferior seed. There were corn conferences in every household, and the final result was not only a great stride in the educational work in that school district, but a decided improvement in the corn crop owing to the better selection of seed corn and the testing of nearly all seed used in the district.

"I think the effect of our seed-corn experiment in the classroom was as great upon myself as it was upon Dick, although he was transformed from the dullest boy in the school into one of the most earnest and interested of pupils. As for myself, the disclosures of that experiment amounted to something like a revelation. That experience gave me a jolt that influenced my whole career. Instead of burying myself in books I studied the boys of my district and spent every available hour of my time in their homes or working with them in the fields and barns, finding out in what they were interested. From these researches I framed the work in the classroom and made a consistent attempt to hook up all the lessons with the actual life of the pupils.

"That experience contains the whole philosophy of the German system of carrying the education of the farm boy and the farm girl straight to the field and to the kitchen. In a pedagogical sense it is undoubtedly the soundest system in existence, the most vital and the most practical. Even in the ordinary country school of America a high percentage of the teaching is unrelated to the actual life—the home conditions—of the pupils. Of course there is a reason for all this.

"Probably no person had so great influence in fixing the characteristics of the common-school system as did Horace Mann. When he exerted that influence he saw that the country was short on the kind of education needed to equip men for the professions. Consequently he provided for that need. Instead of readjusting our educational machinery after that need was met, we have kept driving steadily forward in the same direction, until the whole logic of the situation has been changed and the matter of our academic education has been carried almost to absurdity.

"Now we are facing a revision in our educational system that is bound to be revolutionary. Once I heard the president of a fresh-water college declare that the mission of his institution was to turn out one great man—a great statesman, a great scientist, a great preacher or leader of men. That is the old conception of education, the ideal that is being pushed into the background by the pressure of the practical needs of a great nation of common people. The new education will not bother itself about keeping up the visible supply of greatness, but it will aim to teach every young man and young woman according to his or her needs."

The mistress of a little Iowa school, who had heard Prof. Holden talk for a kind of teaching that would "meet the boys and girls of the farm on their own ground and do something for those that can not go to college," determined to see for herself if there was anything in this theory of teaching farm boys "in the terms of their own every-day lives." As her district was in a dairy community she learned how to test milk and determine its percentage of butter fat. Then she asked each of the older boys in the school how many pounds of milk the best cow in the home dairy yielded each day.

"We've got one," proudly declared one pupil. "that gives 28 quarts—anyhow she did when she was fresh. I don't s'pose there's a better cow than old Brindle in this township."

"But don't you weigh the milk so that you know just what each cow is really giving?" innocently asked the teacher.

"Naw," was the disgusted response. "We keep too many cows to fool with any fussing like that."

"Jim's alus blowing about their Brindle," spoke up the son of a school trustee; "but we've got a new cow that don't need to take anything from any cow in this county. Pa says she's a full-blood Holstein."

"Well," laughed the teacher, "neither of you knows how much milk his cow gives in actual quantity—and if he did that wouldn't tell which is the better cow. This milk is bought by the creamery and made into butter. Suppose that Tom's cow gave 30 quarts a day, but that the milk was not rich enough to make a pound of butter, would the creamery make any money buying that kind of milk?"

"I dunno 'bout that," was the answer. "So long as they take it at the creamery an' don't kick, I guess it's all right."

"Brindle's milk is rich," retorted Jim. "It's almost as yellow as cream."

THE TESTING OF BRINDLE.

"In all the tests it's the quantity of butter fat produced that counts in scoring a dairy cow. What do you say to this plan: Each of you big boys is to select what he considers the best cow in his dairy, weigh her milk each time, and every Monday bring a sample of her milk here for testing? How many of you want to do this?"

Every hand was raised. The milk tests injected into that school a spirit of spontaneous interest that it had never known before. The work of the arithmetic classes was centered on the local milk records, and no example in percentage given in the textbook had ever inspired the eager attention that was given to the problem of figuring the percentages of butter fat in the various tests. This teacher discovered that she had a live school and that the big boys were no longer difficult to handle.

Some months later the father of Jim met the man whose words had inspired this experiment and made a confession.

"When my boy said, 'Teacher's going to have a milk test at school,' I laughed and said it was poppycock. But if the rest of the boys were going into it I didn't want him to show the white feather. I wasn't ashamed of my dairy. Now Jim's got a temper, an' his worst fault as a milker had always been that he'd whale any cow that didn't stand still for him. The cow that he was testing was a little nervous, an' one night I came into the barn just in time to see her give him a kick that would have knocked my disposition into a cocked hat, milk or no milk. I expected to see him go at her with the milking stool and lay it on where she'd feel it most. You could have pushed me over when he got up quietly, talked soft to her, and began milking again as if nothing had happened."

"Then it had always been his job to water the cows. There's a stream in the little pasture, and he was expected to drive the cows to it night and morning. He generally went through the motions, but it took a lot of watching to see that he didn't slight this part of the performance. He'd rush them through their drinks as if he was afraid they'd founder themselves. You know how boys are when they're just going through the motions with something they're not interested in? But after the teacher started that milk weighing and testing business the rush at the creek was all over. That cow—and all the others with her—were fairly teased to drink. They were tempted with salt and given an extra chance at the water."

"That wasn't all. He began to study into the feed question, and finally asked me to buy some stuff that he thought would make more milk and increase the butter fat. I bought it, just to humor him, but only enough for the cow that he was testing. When I saw what it did for her you better believe the rest of 'em had the same ration too. That teacher certainly got Jim going and he wound me up. I wouldn't take a lot of money for what it's done for us. He's interested in his school now and interested in the work at home. And the fathers of the other boys tell me about the same story. That teacher certainly started something. She'd have a hard time getting away from this district. Why, she's got every one of us interested, old and young, and we've got the liveliest school district in the whole country."

COUNTRY LIFE LEADERS.

Undoubtedly the closest American parallel to the German Wanderlehrer is the county demonstrator or agricultural expert. He pays a personal visit to all farms where his aid is asked. If the boy of the farm is present when the demonstrator calls he is free to absorb all the crumbs of instruction he can catch. But with several hundred farms to visit in the course of the cropping season, the county demonstrator can hit only the high spots, and at that his talk is aimed to meet the understanding of the father, not of the boy. All the direct instruction that the county expert can give the boys of his territory is simply covered by the old phrase, "a lick and a promise." He will, if he is greatly in earnest in his efforts, do all the work possible with the school teachers of his county and inspire them to individual work with their pupils. But at best he can only scratch the surface, so far as reaching and arousing the farm boy is concerned.

Here and there throughout the country, however, the common schools are showing that the principle of education involved in the Wanderlehrer system is taking root and producing what the farmer would call a volunteer crop. Cook County, Ill., which contains the second largest city in America, is a case in point. Hereafter this metropolitan county will have five country life leaders. Each must live in the district that he serves and must be on the job 12 month in the year.

When the country schools of the county are in session the work of the country life leader will be mainly in the schools. But during the vacation periods he is expected to follow the footsteps of the German Wanderlehrer and spend as much time as possible in the fields and farm homes of the pupils. As each leader will have the agricultural welfare of 25 schools to look after, it is a foregone conclusion that his individual contact with the pupils in their own home surroundings will be limited. To a large extent the work of the country life leader must be that of inspiring the teachers to a realization of the power to arouse and hold their pupils that is concealed in this new line of teaching. He is the missionary bishop of his diocese, whose largest task is to inspire, instruct, and direct the teacher-missionaries under him. The major part of the pastoral calls and the hand-to-hand work must be left to them. However it is no part of the plan

of County Superintendent Tobin or of Assistant Superintendent Calley to permit the country life leaders to do "too much work at the top and too little at the bottom." For its effect upon himself, quite as much as for its effect upon the pupils, each leader will be required to have a generous amount of contact with the pupils, their parents, and the home fields.

When Superintendent Tobin found that Miss Agnes Ryan, of the Morton Grove district, had revolutionized the spirit of her school by introducing a seed-corn test, he began to look about for other teachers who showed the same symptoms of initiative, the same sympathy with the everyday life of their pupils, and the same capacity to understand country conditions. Six teachers who seemed to possess these qualifications were selected and told to go to Prof. Holden for a talk on how to "get next to the boys and girls of the farm." These teachers returned from their conference equipped with a fresh enthusiasm, with a wider view of the possibilities of this new kind of teaching, with a firmer faith in its results, and with an outfit of the tools needed for the work.

The results accomplished by these teachers have been so notable as to make the country-life movement a part of Cook County's educational system, and to put upon the pay roll the five country-life leaders who are charged with the responsibility of pioneering the movement.

In one district alone the pupils have tested more than 2,000 ears of seed corn in school and perhaps an equal number in their homes. This is district 146, about 2 miles out from the suburban village of La Grange. Miss Mae Foran, the teacher of this school, says that 50 per cent of the corn planted in her district has been tested by the pupils. This work was begun April 8 and continued until the last week of May.

In the opinion of Miss Foran these afternoons were the most valuable of the entire school year, and have done more to connect the school with the realities of the everyday life of her pupils and their parents than have all their studies. While the fact that the corn crop in that district will be greatly increased—probably by 25 per cent—is interesting and significant, Miss Foran regards this as merely an incidental benefit.

SCIENTIFIC CORN TESTING.

The effect of the corn test and the whole country-life movement upon the spirit of the school is illustrated by an experience told by a farmer living just outside the Cook County line. In driving to market he was obliged to pass one of the schools in which this work was in progress. The schoolroom was buzzing like a beehive. The sound was so unlike the familiar droning that he stopped his horse and looked inside. The pupils were crowded about the teacher, and the whole scene resembled the distribution of ice cream at a Sunday-school picnic.

"I saw," says this farmer, "that there was something doing out of the ordinary, something that really interested every pupil in the school. It was the liveliest schoolroom I had ever seen and I wanted to find out the reason why. So I knocked and explained to the teacher the cause of my call. Well, I stayed until school was dismissed and forgot all about my errand at the store. I didn't blame the pupils for being interested, and when I returned home that night I told my boy all about it. He begged to be taken to the school, and I took him there the next afternoon. It almost broke his heart when the teacher told him that as he lived outside the county she could not let him into the corn game. That night, as he told me about it, his lip quivered a little and he said: 'Gee, Pa, I wish they'd lemme go to that school.'

"I never heard a boy talk that way about any country school before, and I never expected to hear it either. When you can get a boy to feel that way about going to a district school the thing at the bottom of his enthusiasm is worth while."

In some of the schools the "rag-baby" testing cloth is used, but as a rule the pupils prefer a germination box with sawdust. Where this method is used the boys of the school build the boxes and the girls mark out the diagrams on the cloth that covers the sawdust. These diagrams identify the kernels with the ear from which they came. All of the six teachers who have done this pioneer work have found the girls of their school as much interested in the country-life lessons of the actual corn and seed testing as the boys.

Perhaps our nearest approach to the German *Wanderlehrerin* in petticoats is the teacher of domestic science in the short-course extension work of the Iowa School of Agriculture. These are the signs of the times, pointing to radical changes, a larger efficiency and a broader service on the part of the rural school.

(Thereupon the committee proceeded to the consideration of executive business, after which it adjourned.)





